



**HARVARD COLLEGE
LIBRARY**



**GIFT OF THE
GOVERNMENT
OF THE UNITED STATES**

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE
SEATTLE, WASH., AREA—Part 2

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

MARCH 18 AND 19, 1955

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

(Index in part 3 of these hearings)



HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

AUG 15 1955

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1955

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., Tennessee

EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

THOMAS W. BEALE, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

March 18, 1955: Testimony of—	Page
Robert B. Krah1_____	379
Robert Miller_____	382
Eugene Victor Dennett (resumed)_____	391
Lawrence Earl George_____	414
Harriett Pierce_____	416
March 19, 1955: Testimony of—	
Eugene Victor Dennett (resumed)_____	419
Paul William Delaney_____	438
Jacob Bitterman_____	441
John Stenhouse_____	443
Afternoon session:	
John Stenhouse (resumed)_____	450
Eugene Victor Dennett (resumed)_____	466
Abraham Arthur Cohen_____	490
Eugene Victor Dennett (resumed)_____	492
Bernard Freyd_____	493
Hans Lenus Adolph Westman_____	495
(Testimony of Eugene V. Dennett, Harold Johnston, Edwin A. Carlson, and Margaret Elizabeth Gustafson, also heard on March 18, 1955, is printed in pt. 1 of this series.)	

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.
(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 84TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 5, 1955

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE SEATTLE, WASH., AREA—Part 2

FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 1955

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Seattle, Wash.

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 1:30 p. m., in Room 402, County-City Building, Seattle, Wash., Hon. Morgan M. Moulder (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Morgan M. Moulder (chairman) and Harold H. Velde.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Are you ready to proceed, Mr. Wheeler?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Robert Krahl.

Mr. MOULDER. Will you hold up your right hand and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. KRAHL. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT B. KRAHL, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, JAY G. SYKES

Mr. WHEELER. Would you state your full name?

Mr. KRAHL. My name is Robert B. Krahl.

Mr. WHEELER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. KRAHL. K-r-a-h-l.

Mr. WHEELER. I see you are represented by counsel.

Will counsel identify himself for the record?

Mr. SYKES. Jay G. Sykes.

Mr. WHEELER. When were you born, Mr. Krahl?

Mr. KRAHL. To the best of my knowledge, I was born on February 6, 1925.

Mr. WHEELER. Where do you presently reside?

Mr. KRAHL. I live in Seattle.

Mr. WHEELER. What is your present occupation?

Mr. KRAHL. I am unemployed.

Mr. WHEELER. What was your occupation before becoming unemployed?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. With the chairman's permission, I would like to make a very, very short statement, less than a hundred words.

Mr. MOULDER. What was the question, Mr. Wheeler?

(The pending question was read by the reporter.)

Mr. MOULDER. That question calls for an answer, not a statement. And you can reply or give the answer, and then make any explanation you wish if it is relevant to the question and your answer.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. Well, I have been employed with odd jobs the past 9 months; haven't really been employed. I just worked a few days here and there.

Mr. WHEELER. Would you relate to the committee your occupational background for the past 5 years?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. To the best of my knowledge—let's see; 5 years would be around 1950. I think I have worked as a waiter, I have worked as a draftsman, I have done a little extra work as a casual laborer, worked a little time in a sawmill—I think that about covers it.

Mr. WHEELER. What is your educational background?

Mr. KRAHL. I graduated from high school. I have got a couple of years of college. I haven't graduated from college.

Mr. WHEELER. What college did you attend?

Mr. KRAHL. The University of Arizona.

Mr. WHEELER. When did you cease your studies there?

Mr. KRAHL. I think it was around the end of 1947.

Mr. WHEELER. How were you employed from 1947 to 1950?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. From 1947 until 1950 I worked as a seaman part of that time; I think most of that time.

Mr. WHEELER. Have you served in the Armed Forces?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. Yes; I have.

Mr. WHEELER. In what branch of the service did you serve?

Mr. KRAHL. In the United States Army.

Mr. WHEELER. What were your dates of service?

Mr. KRAHL. I am not sure, but I think it was around the beginning of 1951 until about the end of it, probably 2 weeks after the first of the year, until a week prior to Christmas 1951, I am pretty sure.

Mr. WHEELER. What type of discharge did you receive?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. I received a general discharge under honorable conditions.

Mr. WHEELER. Are you familiar with the committee called the Youth Committee that is within the circles of the Communist Party in King County?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to invoke the fifth amendment on the ground that I think that this may lead into questions which could force me to testify against myself.

Mr. WHEELER. Are you acquainted with Mrs. Barbara Hartle?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. I give the same answer, for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. MOULDER. You decline to answer for the same reason?

Mr. KRAHL. I decline to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to refer to part 2 of a document entitled "Investigation of Communist Activities in the Pacific Northwest Area." It is a copy of the transcript of hearings held here last June. Mrs. Hartle is testifying:

About 1949 and 1950, the last year that I was in Seattle—a youth committee was set up which I worked with, controlled, and guided all of its activities and tried to train the youth along Communist Party lines; and on that youth committee I remember a young man named Al Cumming, Robert Krahl, Calvin Harris.

Are you acquainted with Mr. Al Cumming?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. I invoke the fifth amendment for the reasons previously stated. I believe that is the way to work it.

Mr. WHEELER. What were the functions of the youth committee of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. I again invoke the fifth amendment on the grounds previously stated, and refuse to answer.

Mr. WHEELER. Was Mrs. Hartle correct when she identified you as a member of the Communist Party, a member of the youth committee?

Mr. KRAHL. I give the same answer, for the same reasons.

Mr. WHEELER. Are you a member of the Communist Party today?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. I give the same answer, for the same reasons.

Mr. WHEELER. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you decline to answer as to whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party today, and, as the reason for your refusal, do you invoke the fifth amendment?

Mr. KRAHL. That is correct; yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Velde, any questions?

Mr. VELDE. Were you a member of the Communist Party during the time you were in the Army?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. For the reasons previously stated, I must invoke the fifth amendment and refuse to answer.

Mr. VELDE. I take it that you will refuse to give this committee the benefit of your knowledge concerning the Communist Party activities, and rely on the fifth amendment whenever you are questioned about anything touching on communism. Is that correct?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons and the reasons I have previously stated.

Mr. VELDE. That is all.

Mr. MOULDER. How long were you in the service? I forgot the period of time. That is, in the armed services of the United States.

Mr. KRAHL. About a year. Just under a year.

Mr. MOULDER. Was that the full period of your enlistment, the time you served, or were you discharged prior to the termination of your period of enlistment?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. Well, I was drafted. I didn't enlist.

Mr. MOULDER. Why were you discharged?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. I decline to answer, reluctantly, because I am a little—I don't really understand where this question of waiver comes in. So I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment, and for the reasons that I have previously stated.

Mr. MOULDER. Where were you stationed while in the service?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. Well, I was stationed for a while at Fort Ord. I think it was a few days. And then I served the rest of my time at Camp Roberts.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party? I believe the question was asked in another form.

Mr. KRAHL. Mr. Chairman, I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment, and for the reasons I have previously stated.

Mr. VELDE. Did I understand you to say that you were given a general discharge under honorable conditions from the Army?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. That is what I said; that is correct.

Mr. VELDE. That is not as high class a discharge as an honorable discharge; is it?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. Well, I really don't know. I don't know the answer to that.

Mr. VELDE. Don't you have any idea why you weren't given an honorable discharge instead of a general discharge?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. At this point I invoke the fifth amendment and decline to answer that question on the grounds that I have previously stated.

Mr. VELDE. That is all.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you know whether or not you were discharged for security reasons?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly invoke the fifth amendment again, and for the same reasons, the reasons that I have previously stated.

Mr. MOULDER. While you were serving in the armed services were you at any time engaged in any un-American or subversive activities?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. KRAHL. Mr. Chairman, I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment and for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Call your next witness.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Robert Miller.

Mr. MOULDER. Put up your right hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. MILLER. I do, sir.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT MILLER, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, SOLIE M. RINGOLD

Mr. WHEELER. State your name, please.

Mr. MILLER. My name is Robert Miller.

Mr. WHEELER. When were you born, Mr. Miller?

Mr. MILLER. To the best of my knowledge, November 22, 1922.

Mr. WHEELER. Where do you presently reside?

Mr. MILLER. Seattle, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. What has been your educational background?

Mr. MILLER. General, normal grammar school. I don't know whether you call it junior or senior. And up to the third year of high school.

Mr. WHEELER. Are you currently employed?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. How are you employed?

Mr. MILLER. I am an appliance, radio and television repair man, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Is that here in Seattle?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. And what has your employment background been, say since 1940?

Mr. MILLER. Since 1940, part of the time in the shipyards, part of the time in Boeing Airplane Co. Part of the time also was spent in the Armed Forces during the period which you mentioned.

Mr. WHEELER. What is your military service record?

Mr. MILLER. I was inducted into the Navy, and, the best I can recall, the dates are from June of 1945 until March of 1946.

Mr. WHEELER. What type of discharge did you receive?

Mr. MILLER. It is difficult for me to answer that. I believe it was an honorable discharge. There is some question now that you bring it up, as to whether it was what the Navy refers to as a battleship discharge, which I think they reserve to only those who have served overseas. There are no peculiarities in regard to my discharge, if that is the intent of the question.

Mr. WHEELER. When were you employed at Boeing Aircraft?

Mr. MILLER. To the best of my knowledge, with interruptions, of course, it was in 1943. I do not know now when I was last employed by Boeing Aircraft except to place it in relation to an event which would be several months prior to the strike which has been mentioned, of course, in the proceedings. I could not recall even the month or the year involved.

Mr. WHEELER. How were your services terminated at Boeing?

Mr. MILLER. My services were terminated for lack of attendance there.

Mr. WHEELER. Lack of attendance at work?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. While at Boeing were you a member of any union?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. What union was it?

Mr. MILLER. The Aeronautical Mechanics Union,¹ sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Are you still a member?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Why are you no longer a member of the union?

Mr. MILLER. Because when I was terminated from Boeing Aircraft I saw no reasons for further continuing membership, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. I see you are represented by counsel.

Will you identify yourself, please?

Mr. RINGOLD. My name is Solie, S-o-l-i-e, M. Ringold, R-i-n-g-o-l-d. I am an attorney practicing law in the city of Seattle.

Mr. WHEELER. Do you know a person by the name of Barbara Hartle?

Mr. MILLER. I have known her in the past, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Under what circumstances have you known her?

Mr. MILLER. I recall one. I have eaten dinner with her at my father-in-law's establishment.

Mr. WHEELER. Did you ever see her on any other occasion?

¹This is a reference to International Association of Machinists, AFL, Aeronautical Industrial District Lodge 751.

Mr. MILLER. I have seen her on television, perhaps on the street, and I may have other than that.

Mr. WHEELER. Do you recall ever meeting her in connection with Communist Party activities?

Mr. MILLER. It is difficult to say as to what were the connections. I would say that perhaps it was in relation to the Communist Party, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. When did you first become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. To the best of my knowledge, in 1943, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. What were the circumstances under which you joined the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. It is difficult to reach back that far for me and determine just what motivated my becoming a member. The only thing that I can recall is I attended several open Communist Party meetings during that period of time and I saw nothing at variance with what I believed to be for the common good of the people of the country. I thereupon became active, and I could not even recall the initial period of action, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Who contacted you to get you in the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. That I could not recall at this time, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. After you joined the Communist Party were you assigned to any particular group or unit?

Mr. MILLER. Not at any time that I recall, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Not at all?

Mr. MILLER. Not that I can recall, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. How long were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. There were perhaps interruptions while I was in the service; I believe there were. To the best of my knowledge, I was probably a member of the Communist Party from 1943 until 1948, the best I can recall. I believe there was a period of time there that I was not a member, and it is hard for me to distinguish between what is actual membership and carrying of a card, if there is such a thing, or payment of dues, and whether I just worked with them. It is difficult to reach that far back in my mind, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. During this 1943-48 period I believe you stated you were in the United States Navy. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER. For a portion of that—from 1945 until 1946. Approximately 9 months, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. WHEELER. When did you say your employment terminated at Boeing Aircraft?

Mr. MILLER. I cannot name a date. I can only relate it to some several months prior to the major strike which they had. I could not name the date.

Mr. WHEELER. Was that in 1943 or 1944?

Mr. MILLER. No. Could someone refresh me as to when the strike occurred at Boeing Aircraft Co.?

It was 1946 or 1947; I believe in there, at the time which I was terminated.

Mr. WHEELER. Were you a member of the Communist Party while employed at Boeing?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Were you employed at Boeing when you became a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. I do not recall. I think I was perhaps a member prior to going to Boeing Aircraft Co. I do not recall, however.

Mr. WHEELER. Mrs. Hartle, in previous testimony before the committee, went into quite a bit of detail on the efforts of the Communist Party to infiltrate Boeing Aircraft. Do you have any knowledge along those lines?

Mr. MILLER. The answer that you want from me is whether there was any direction as far as I was concerned, as to where to get employment. Is that, as I understand, the intent of the question?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. At no time, to the best of my recollection, was I directed to go anywhere to work or to do any specific thing, as I can recall it now.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have knowledge of any attempt by the Communist Party to infiltrate the Boeing plant?

Mr. MILLER. I have no specific knowledge which I can testify as to facts, sir. I assume that is what you want, only things I know to be fact.

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. Did you ever hold an office in the Aero Mechanics Union?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. I was at one time a shop steward, at one time a shop committeeman, and, if memory serves me right, I was president of one of the locals during the war. I am not too clear on whether that was president or vice president, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. To your knowledge, were there any other members of the Communist Party in the Aero Mechanics Union?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know with any degree of certainty anyone at Boeing while I was there who might have been members of the Communist Party. There was certainly speculation or perhaps reason to assume they were. However, I would like to confine my testimony to facts, and I do not know any to be a fact.

Mr. WHEELER. We desire to be confined to facts. Are you testifying that you knew no one at Boeing Aircraft Co., to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. To the best of my recollection at this time, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. You knew no one in the Aero Machinists Union to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. In the Aero Mechanics Union?

Mr. WHEELER. Aero Mechanics; I am sorry.

Mr. MILLER. I relate the two together, in that I believe the Aero Mechanics were only involved with employees of Boeing.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WHEELER. You have also stated, I believe, that you were not assigned to any group or unit of the Communist Party.

Mr. MILLER. To the best of my recollection, that was my testimony, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. You don't recall who recruited you into the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. I do not, sir. In fact, I might explain it this way: I am not even sure whether it was any specific individual or whether, during the course of an open meeting, it fell upon me, a desire to become a member. It is difficult for a man to reach that far back in years and testify with any certainty, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. You were very vague in your testimony as to how you became a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MILLER. Sir, is it unreasonable to be vague on something that occurred nigh onto 12 years ago when I was between the age of 20 and 21, sir? Is that difficult to understand, that a man might honestly be vague?

Mr. WHEELER. How many meetings of the Communist Party did you attend from 1943 until the time you went in the Armed Forces in 1945?

Mr. MILLER. I would be unable to give you any number with any degree of accuracy. It would be pure speculation and only an estimate. If you want an estimate, I could give it if the committee so desires.

Mr. WHEELER. I think you can speculate on this part of your testimony.

Mr. MILLER. As I get the question, you are asking me how many do I think might have gone to. If I am recalling something I would have an actual number and would not have to estimate. I am not able to recall any number of meetings at which I attended. There was perhaps 30, 40 meetings, I do not know, over this period of time. It is purely a speculative answer, sir.

Mr. Wheeler. But you may have attended that many?

Mr. MILLER. That is right. And that may be at variance 50 percent one way or the other.

Mr. WHEELER. We are not binding you on this.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Where were these meetings held that you attended?

Mr. MILLER. I cannot recall specifically where any meetings might have been held. In fact, most of my activity while at Boeing's was in legitimate, recognized trade-union work within the framework of the contract with Boeing Aircraft Co. Most, or if any, activity with other members, who I perhaps suspected to be Communists, or persons of my particular persuasion, was not in the form of a meeting, but perhaps I would meet one while at work, or I might meet one at the cafeteria, or several of us might meet together in the cafeteria and just discuss general problems.

Mr. WHEELER. Did you receive any direction from the Communist Party to conceal your membership because of your employment at Boeing's?

Mr. MILLER. I do not believe it was at anyone's direction. Thinking back—and I can only assign a reason now going backward—I perhaps knew of my own intelligence not to do so. I would perhaps be expelled from the Aero Mechanics Union, which, of course, would mean loss of employment at Boeing's. I do not recall any specific direction.

Mr. WHEELER. But you have testified that you may have attended approximately 40 meetings during the period from 1943 to 1945, a period of, say, 18 months or 20 months.

Mr. MILLER. I had thought I was testifying during the whole period at which I was in the party.

Mr. WHEELER. No, it is confined to the period from the time you joined the Communist Party to when you entered the United States Navy.

Mr. MILLER. Well then, of course, it makes more obvious that the answer was purely speculative and could well have been largely in error. I thought I was answering or speculating in regard to my whole membership in the Communist Party.

Mr. WHEELER. Would you like to estimate again that period of time?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I have got to go backward here. Which period of time are you referring to?

Mr. WHEELER. From the time you joined the Communist Party until you entered the United States Navy.

Mr. MILLER. That would be from 1943 up until 1945. Right? Two years?

Mr. WHEELER. That is right.

Mr. MILLER. Again a purely speculative answer: perhaps 20 meetings, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Now you attended approximately 20 meetings from 1943 to 1945. And from 1946 to 1948 you attended approximately 20 more. And you don't recall the place where any of these meetings were held?

Mr. MILLER. I have testified where I recalled that I thought we had conducted some. I cannot recall any specific place. One or two might have occurred at a rooming house where I stayed. I do not recall, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Where were they usually held? Was there a regular meeting place?

Mr. MILLER. To the best of my knowledge; no, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Who called the meetings? That is, how did you get a notice there was going to be a meeting held somewhere? How did you know where to go?

Mr. MILLER. About the only way that I can think of it backward now, and I am not at all sure, is I would probably see or meet someone else on the job or in the cafeteria, and they might mention that we were going to get together and discuss the general problems.

Mr. MOULDER. On the average, how many people would ordinarily attend those meetings?

Mr. MILLER. As I recall it, it was a very, very few. I could not say. Probably under 10, looking way, way back. But it is difficult to say.

Mr. MOULDER. Were they composed of people that you knew at the same place of employment?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. All of them?

Mr. MILLER. To the best of my knowledge now; yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Wheeler.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, might I make one brief point in regard to this time? It might be better understood.

The question probably arises as to how I am so vague on meetings and meeting places. It might be better understood if we take into account that, as best I can recall, this occurred during the time when the Communist Party was then the Communist Political Association. I believe that they held open meetings. I do not recall too much secrecy involved in it. And for that reason secrecy did not perhaps impress itself on my mind. And to recall in one period of time where a change takes place and into another, it changes things, looking backward and forward.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes; I can appreciate what you are saying.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Mr. MOULDER. At those meetings would there be a record kept of the meeting; minutes of any sort?

Mr. MILLER. Not to my knowledge, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Would there be an officer or a person presiding at the meeting? Someone who would act as a chairman or some official?

Mr. MILLER. Whether it would be a person who acted as a chairman or whom the rest might just look to on the basis that—from the manner in which they spoke, they appeared to—

Mr. MOULDER. Were dues paid at those meetings?

Mr. MILLER. I cannot recall anything specific. However, I would imagine that there were, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. I wish to compliment you for coming forward here as a witness admitting that you were a member of the Communist Party, which is far better and a better reflection upon you as an individual and as an American citizen than to hide behind the fifth amendment. But surely while you were a member you recall having paid membership dues.

Mr. MILLER. Sir, I would have to answer it in this way, that undoubtedly I did. However, to recall a specific instance—I could not.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you recall the name of any one person who attended those meetings at any time? I mean during that long period of time, with the frequent meetings you have admitted that you attended, and the close contact that you had with the individuals, where you say you not only attended meetings, but frequently had lunch or ate meals together or visited with one another and discussed the meetings, surely you could remember the name of at least one person or more that you know, of your own personal knowledge, who associated with you at the same time in that respect.

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps I am confused. Perhaps that is the difficulty I have in answering. I was under the impression that the only names which you wished from me, to give out here publicly, would be persons whom I was certain or knew to be Communists.

Mr. MOULDER. Right.

Mr. MILLER. And it is only for that reason that I do not mention names. It is probable that I could prod my memory into remembering persons whom I met with or worked with while at Boeing's in the trade unions. But to identify them here gives the impression that I am identifying them as Communists, which I do not know to be a certainty.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you recall the names of any persons who attended any of those meetings that you have referred to as Communist Party meetings or as Communist Political Association committee meetings, who were not members of the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. Sir, I could not be certain of where they were. I mean either way. If I was certain of those who were not members, that, by process of elimination, would make me certain of those who were. And I am not certain either way, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Mrs. Hartle testified that you were a member of the Holly Park Branch of the Communist Party. Does that refresh your memory to any degree?

Mr. MILLER. In relation to what question, sir?

Mr. WHEELER. Do you recall being a member of that unit or cell of the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. I do not recall any activity in the branch that is mentioned. It is possible that in their records or in their determination that they maybe have regarded me as a member of that branch and that I did reside there.

Mr. WHEELER. You testified that during the period of time of your membership, the Communist Party was dissolved and the Communist Political Association formed. However, when you returned back from the Army in 1946 the Communist Political Association had been disbanded and the Communist Party reformed. A reorganization had taken place and the party had tightened up considerably after the Duclos letter, if you are familiar with that.

But did you notice, upon your return from the Armed Forces, any difference in the structure of the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. I don't know that I paid any particular attention, sir. I don't recall any great activity in the Communist Party after I returned from the service.

Mr. WHEELER. You have also testified that you left the Communist Party in 1948. For what reasons did you leave the party?

Mr. MILLER. As to the best of my knowledge, sir, I was dropped from the Communist Party for inactivity.

Mr. WHEELER. Have you attended any other Communist Party-type meetings like the Socialist Workers Party since you left the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. To be specific, as far as the Socialist Workers Party, I never have. And, to the best of my knowledge, I have attended no meetings of that type, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. And at this time you cannot recall one individual who was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I could put it this way: I could recall knowing Barbara Hartle. The only way I could say that she was is that she has publicly testified that she was.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further questions at this time. However, I would like to recommend that the witness' subpoena be continued.

Mr. MOULDER. All right.

Do you have a question, Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

I believe you said you got out of the Army in 1948. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER. To the best of my knowledge, sir.

Mr. VELDE. What prompted you to get out of the Communist Party when you did?

Mr. MILLER. To the best of my knowledge, the party dropped me for inactivity, sir.

Mr. VELDE. You never wrote a letter disavowing membership in the Communist Party then?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir, I never did.

Mr. VELDE. Or any other formal withdrawal from the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. Not to my knowledge, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Are you a Communist Party member today?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir, I am not. And again I have to testify to the best of my knowledge. I hope and trust that no one has me on the rolls unbeknownst to me. To my knowledge, I am not a member, no, sir.

Mr. VELDE. I certainly do appreciate your coming forward. It is rather refreshing.

It appears to me that with a little searching of your memory you might be able to recall some of the incidents more clearly than you have. I am sorry to say you are vague in your testimony about

activities of the Communist Party in this area. So I will be in favor of the recommendation of Mr. Wheeler that you be retained under subpoena so that you might check. If you want any assistance from our files, I am sure Mr. Wheeler will be able to give that to you. Next time you testify you may testify a little more definitely.

Mr. MOULDER. For your own benefit and for your own interest, I will ask you this question:

You say, as far as you know, you are no longer a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. That is with the fear that some organization or someone might still be carrying your name on the rolls.

Mr. MILLER. It is a possibility.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you publicly, and here and now before this committee, disavow any belief in the Communist Party and refute all of the principles and policies for which it stands? Do you now take that stand, and do you now so testify?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MILLER. The question, as I understand it, is—I mean the question of my avowal of a belief.

I hope I am allowed a little bit of latitude in answering this.

I state I am not a member of the Communist Party today due to any action on my part. I further state that I disavow anything which is contrary to the best interests of our country and of our people. As to pinning it down to the Communist Party, I have to frankly concede that I am not at all sure where the Communist Party is. I mean if the things that are ascribed to them are true, certainly I disavow them. I say that I have no association with them. It is only that I hesitate to disavow anything that I am not sure of.

I am sure of the one thing, that I am opposed to anything that is against the best interests of the people of our country.

Actually, since I was dropped in 1948 I have been inactive in all political activities to the point where I am not even registered to vote, I don't believe, since 1948. I am confused on where most everybody stands, and I have not enough facts to draw a conclusion on it.

Mr. MOULDER. The reason I ask you that question is because there is considerable evidence before this committee and other investigative Government agencies that many Communist Party members ceased to be active as party members but have gone underground and still continue in their same belief, the same philosophy, and with, of course, the same objectives. I believe your answer is clear to this point: you attended all of those Communist Party meetings; I believe you said a hundred, and it would vary one way or another, 50 percent either way.

Mr. VELDE. Approximately 40, wasn't it?

Mr. MILLER. That is it.

Mr. MOULDER. But during that period of time you certainly must have been well versed and qualified to know the purposes and the policies of the Communist Party as such, because at those meetings didn't you study the Communist Party literature and study the purposes for which it was organized?

Mr. MILLER. Is that the question?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Yes, I did.

Mr. MOULDER. Has your opinion now changed with respect to the

Communist Party from what it was when you were attending the Communist Party meetings? Or is it the same as it was then?

Mr. MILLER. I see what you are driving at, and it is hard for me to get my understanding across.

Mr. MOULDER. You say you have severed your association with the party, and I want to know if it is just a technical disassociation or is it a clean break from the Communist Party?

Mr. MILLER. No; it is not a technical disassociation. If I might have a moment, I would like to go on a little further.

First, the reference is to having attended, say, up to 40 meetings, one way or the other, and being aware of the goal of the Communist Party. I would have to say this in all honesty: During the time I was a member of the Communist Party I at no time was aware of their desire to do anything which was contrary to the best interests of the people. Now it could conceivably be that I was not aware, perhaps naive.

All of my activity—and, in fact, that is what prompted me not to take the fifth amendment. At no time in my life have I knowingly done anything contrary to the best interests of the people of this country. And certainly were I to be aware of that in an association and continue activity I would be guilty of doing something against the best interests of the people.

Mr. MOULDER. The subpoena that has been served upon you will be in full force and effect. You will be subject to recall upon due notice.

Mr. MILLER. Should I leave for the day?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

The subpoena will remain in full force and effect, and you will be subject to recall upon due notice at any time in the future. That does not mean, of course, that you have to attend any of the hearings here today or tomorrow.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call Mr. Eugene V. Dennett at this time.

TESTIMONY OF EUGENE VICTOR DENNETT, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, KENNETH A. MacDONALD—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dennett, at the time we suspended your testimony you had completed your narrative with regard to your experience in the CCC camp, and told us that immediately thereafter you had been shanghaied into working shipping.

(At this point Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room.)

Mr. DENNETT. A little freight boat here in Puget Sound.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am sure that would be a very interesting story, but it is not a matter we are investigating in our work here.

After you had that experience how long was it before you returned to the work of the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. It was within a very few months because I didn't know at the time I started to work in the freight-boat industry in Puget Sound that there was an organizing drive of a union to organize the employees and that they had reached the point before I came along where they had entered into an arbitration. And they were awaiting the decision of this arbitrator. Finally the decision came down, I think about 3 or 4 months after I entered the industry, and the decision was so adverse that the men stopped work as soon as the boats got into port.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by saying that a decision came down?

Mr. DENNETT. The arbitrator handed down his decision. He was a very long time making his decision. When it finally came down it was very disagreeable to all the employees. In fact, they rejected it; they refused to accept it and called a strike.

When they called that strike they were confronted with a problem of electing delegates to attend a meeting of the union to determine what course of action to pursue.

I was elected a delegate from the crew that I was working with.

When we arrived at this meeting—I believe the meeting was held in the labor temple—we discussed the award, and the union leaders at that time were very frankly disappointed in the results of it.

The sum total of it was that it led to a strike, and the members seemed to like the way I presented their case during the course of the arguments, getting ready for the strike. And when the strike occurred I was elected chairman of the strike committee and chairman of the negotiating committee.

So we were again brought into public attention, and the Communist Party looked me up very quickly to find out what was going on and to try to advise me how to conduct myself in the course of that strike. They really knew very little about it. They learned a great deal from me because I was working with the men. And their advice was I must immediately fight the leadership of the union.

I made a few feeble efforts in that direction and found that I didn't have any good reason for fighting that leadership because they were carrying out the program which I had advocated in the original strike meeting to satisfy the needs of the members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Apparently, the Communist Party was more interested in promoting its own objectives than it was the objectives of the union which was on strike.

Mr. DENNETT. They were anxious that someone from the Communist Party gain control in that organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the organization?

Mr. DENNETT. At that time it was called the Ferry Boatmen's Union of the Pacific. It later has changed its name, and, in making use of that name, I certainly want it to be clearly understood that using that name in nowise should be construed as meaning that it was any Communist organization because it was not.

Mr. TAVENNER. It rather demonstrated just the contrary.

Mr. DENNETT. And its leaders were not.

But the leaders of that organization were making as sincere an effort as they knew how to represent the wishes and needs of the membership.

While there were some tactical differences between myself and them on various occasions, we did adopt a program wherein we agreed with each other that none of us would attempt to do anything or to speak in behalf of the organization without conferring with the other. In other words, we made a mutual agreement among ourselves as officials of the strike committee which required the exchange of mutual confidence. And, to the best of my ability, I carried that out, and I think, in all fairness, it should be said that, to the best of their ability, they carried their part out. I think the value of that is demonstrated by the fact that in the final settlement of that strike we succeeded in raising the wages of the freight-boat employees from

\$49 per month, without any regulation of hours, to a wage of about \$150 per month with a regulation of hours and provision for overtime.

Mr. VELDE (presiding).

I am not quite clear about this ferry boatmen's union. Was it a local union not affiliated with any other?

Mr. DENNETT. It was a part of an American Federation affiliate. At that time it was the Ferry Boatmen's Union of the Pacific, affiliated with the International Seamen's Union of America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. VELDE. In what year?

Mr. DENNETT. That was in 1936.

Mr. VELDE. How large was the local? How many members?

Mr. DENNETT. I think there were in the neighborhood of 300 or 400 members in Puget Sound at that time. But that, of course, controlled all the tug boats and all the barges, all the towing, all the servicing, on the waterside of the smaller vessels.

I think that that completes the statement of what was in progress at the time of the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. After this experience on the waterfront what was your next contact with the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. The next occurred in the district council of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific. That was Northwest District Council No. 1 which was in Seattle. This was the council to which delegates were sent from all the maritime unions.

(At this point Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. DENNETT. And some of the shoreside unions, which worked in the shipyards.

These unions were brought together in the 1934 strike, which was before my time. And I would be presuming on you to try to give any testimony about the exact way in which it was formed except to say that, consistent with the Communist Party policy, it was our objective, from the days of the old Marine Workers Industrial Union, which was one of the affiliates of the Red International of Labor Unions, to organize all the maritime workers into one organization.

However, it was the desire of the workers in the industry to choose their membership in the duly constituted, chartered organizations of craft unions which were already in the field, such as the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, the Marine Firemen, Oilers, Water Tenders and Wipers Association, the Marine Cooks and Stewards of the Pacific.¹ And later on I believe the radio operators, the masters, mates, and pilots,² and the marine engineers.³ Then, of course, the shoreside organizations of longshoremen, machinists and shipwrights, joiners, boiler-makers. There were many organizations that were involved in any kind of waterborne traffic.

Through the Maritime Federation of the Pacific all of these were brought together, and, for a brief period of time at least, cooperated quite successfully.

However, by 1935 one organization began to object to the Communist Party influence in the federation. That was the sailors' union

¹ This is a reference to National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards.

² This is a reference to Masters, Mates, and Pilots of America, National Organization (AFL).

³ This is a reference to National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association (CIO).

under Harry Lundeborg. However, in that dispute it wasn't clear to the average person who was in the industry just what the nature of the dispute was, and most people felt that the dispute was a personal dispute between the leaders of the sailors and the leaders of the longshoremen. My own knowledge of the situation, of a later date, would lead me to believe that that is not an adequate explanation of what the dispute was all about.

The dispute ran much deeper than personality clashes. The dispute was a fundamental policy question dispute, and that dispute centered around whether or not the organization would move closer and closer to the Red International of Labor Unions through this new form or whether it would permit itself to separate into the respective component parts and each function separately and independently without that international Red affiliation.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the outcome of that dispute?

Mr. DENNETT. The outcome was that the split spread. First one organization and then another began to have misgivings as to the consequences of being full partners in the Maritime Federation of the Pacific.

The first one to show the disaffection were the sailors. Subsequently the marine firemen showed disaffection. Then the master mates and pilots showed disaffection. And the marine engineers showed disaffection. The radio operators began to show some disaffection. Some of the longshoremen showed disaffection.

So the result was that by the time 1937 or 1938 rolled around the Maritime Federation was becoming sort of a bare skeleton which existed with a powerful name but did not have the moral backing and support of the members of the organizations that were affiliated to it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the organization Communist-dominated?

Mr. DENNETT. The Maritime Federation of the Pacific top leadership had at all times some prominent Communist leaders, some persons who were Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you at this time give us the names of those who occupied an official position in that organization who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. One of the first ones that I knew was a man by the name of Walter Stack.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did Walter Stack become very prominent in the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. Walter Stack was in the marine firemen's union and exercised a great deal of influence in that organization here.

Another was Ernest Fox. Ernest Fox was a patrolman in the Sailors Union of the Pacific, and he exercised a great deal of influence in the sailors union. He was one of the original ones. When Mr. Lundeborg was the first president of the organization Mr. Fox was his right hand bower who did most of the leg work for Mr. Lundeborg at that time. Lundeborg was the first president of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific.

Mr. TAVENNER. At that time was he anti-Communist?

Mr. DENNETT. I think, from the stories that I have been told, that Mr. Lundeborg was thought so well of at that time that he was invited to take part and did participate in some top fraction meetings of the Communist Party in the Maritime Federation. And when he turned against the Communist Party a little bit later on that incensed the

Communists so much that they looked upon Mr. Lundeborg as a potential traitor who might reveal a good deal more about them than they wished to have revealed, so that they launched many attacks upon Mr. Lundeborg for the political purpose of diverting the attention from the real reason for the attack.

I do not mean to say by that that I endorsed everything Mr. Lundeborg did, because I disagreed with most of the things he did on a straight trade-union basis on a later date. But this much about that relationship I do know, and I know that—continuing the answer to your question as to the others—the next one whom I knew who also became president of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific was a man by the name of James Engstrom.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the name, please.

Mr. DENNETT. E-n-g-s-t-r-o-m.

Mr. DENNETT. E-n-g-s-t-r-o-m. Engstrom also came from the Marine Firemen's Union here in the Seattle branch. Mr. Engstrom exercised powerful influence in the organization. However, he came to a very sad end in his relationships there because, for some reason or other, he began to have some difficulty following the Communist Party line and instructions, and ultimately took a vacation, went to Alaska, thought the situation over, and I believe that he informed some Federal Government agency of his connection and relationship at that time, and severed his connection or resigned from his position, and what happened to him after that I do not know.

Mr. VELDE. I am not clear on this probably because I am not up on my organization of labor unions as well as I should be.

Was the Sailors Union of the Pacific a part of the unit within the federation?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes, it was affiliated.

Mr. VELDE. It was not a new organization then when it split off under—

Mr. DENNETT. No. The Sailors Union of the Pacific is one of the oldest organizations on the west coast, founded originally by old Andrew Furuseth.

Mr. VELDE. Is the same true of the other organizations that split from the federation? Were they at one time units within the federation?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes, they were. Later on there was a man that became an official in the Maritime Federation, by the name of Pringle, P-r-i-n-g-l-e. I do not remember his first name. Pringle occupied a high position in the federation. I do not recall at this moment the exact position, but I do know that when I had business to transact on behalf of the Ferry Boatsmen's Union at that time, as it was known, I had to deal with Mr. Pringle. And he was a member of the party also.

Later on I came to know another person who later became president of the Maritime Federation, and was the last president to the best of my recollection, a man by the name of Bruce Hannon, H-a-n-n-o-n. Mr. Bruce Hannon was a longshoreman from the city of Seattle, worked on the Seattle waterfront for a good many years. Mr. Hannon also came into conflict with the Communist Party policy while he was a member of the Communist Party, and totally disagreed with the decision to wipe out the Maritime Federation.

The policy decision arrived at on that question was due to the fact that the CIO was coming into existence in 1937, and it was the belief

of the Communist Party that if the Maritime Federation were dissolved and liquidated that the affiliates of it would form a very good, solid, and substantial core of the new CIO organization and would be able to take all the fishermen unions with it into the CIO.

Mr. Hannon did not agree with that policy. He felt that the Maritime Federation still had a function to perform and it should not have been liquidated. And he came into violent dispute with the party leadership over that question. How it was finally resolved I do not know. I did not see Mr. Hannon until after the war, and I met him one day very casually and he did not at that time express anything definitive which I could contribute now to enlighten anyone as to what he felt except to say that he was still bitter.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a result of that change of emphasis on the part of the Communist Party, that is, from the Maritime Federation to its component parts, which were to form another organization, was the Maritime Federation of the Pacific disbanded?

Mr. DENNETT. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the approximate date?

Mr. DENNETT. To the best of my recollection, it would be right around 1938 or 1939. I may be a little bit off one year or another there, but it is close to that date.

Mr. TAVENNER. During this period, between the time that you were shanghaied on a boat here in Seattle and 1938, did you engage in any other activities in the Communist Party not connected with maritime affairs?

Mr. DENNETT. I certainly did. I was sent as a delegate from the Inlandboatmen's Union.¹ The name didn't become Inlandboatmen until much later, but I think of it now in that term. The name actually was Ferry Boatmen's Union at that time.

As a result of the successful conduct of our strike in 1936, the members and the good relationship which was established between the officers and myself, the officers agreed with the membership in electing me a delegate to represent the organization in the Central Labor Council. And that, of course, involved attending a weekly meeting every Wednesday night in the labor temple.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. DENNETT. In Seattle.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just tell us very briefly what the Central Labor Council was.

Mr. DENNETT. It was the city organization to which all American Federation of Labor affiliates were affiliated, and sent delegates to discuss their mutual business weekly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the fact that you were sent there as a delegate make you a member of the Central Labor Council?

Mr. DENNETT. It did. Because of my activity in the Maritime Federation District Council, the delegates there, most of whom were also delegates to the Central Labor Council, elected me chairman of the maritime caucus which was comprised of all those affiliates from the maritime unions who were also affiliates of the Central Labor Council. There was a duplication of affiliation there, and I was elected chairman of that caucus. As that chairman, I was able to speak in behalf of that caucus—all those maritime delegates—which was the largest caucus at that time in the Central Labor Council.

¹ This is a reference to Inland Boatmen's Union of the Pacific.

Consequently, when I arose to speak the chairman of the Central Labor Council would recognize me rather than recognize any other member of the caucus because he was recognizing the duly elected leadership of the caucus. Consequently, it was my function to represent that caucus on the floor of the Central Labor Council on all important questions, which I did. And it caused a great deal of attention to be focused on my work and on the work of the maritime unions.

We were trying our level best to support the policies which the Communist Party urged upon us, and that pertained especially to the question of war, fighting the program of involvement in war at that time. It involved being very critical of the top leadership of the American Federation of Labor, which many other people criticized as well as we, and by we, I mean the Communists were not the only ones that criticized; many of the rank-and-file members who had no knowledge of Communist Party policy or activity were also critical. But because of this similarity of criticism, the Communists, knowing where they were going, were able to direct this criticism along very effective lines. And I was a central instrument in that effort in the Central Labor Council in the city of Seattle.

MR. TAVENNER. As a result of your experience on the Central Labor Council were you selected for other organizational work in the Communist Party?

MR. DENNETT. Yes, I was.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your work?

MR. DENNETT. The Communist Party recognized that the position which I was attaining in the Central Labor Council represented a powerful political influence in the city because the city of Seattle at that time had the reputation of being the best organized labor city in the United States of America. There was hardly an industry that was not actually organized in some labor union, holding bona fide labor-union contracts with its management or employer. And the city had a very wide reputation in that respect. Some people looked upon that as good; some people looked upon it as bad. The Communist Party looked upon it as being very good because it provided us an opportunity to reach every single worker in the city indirectly.

MR. TAVENNER. Would you say that as a result of your successful efforts while a member of the Central Labor Council, you took part in other Communist Party activities?

MR. DENNETT. That is true.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you describe the nature of those activities?

MR. DENNETT. It was in the Washington Commonwealth Federation, which was an organization which came into existence, the elements of it came into existence, prior to my coming from the CCC's. But this organization originally grew out of the transformation from the unemployed to the employed workers. And people built what was known as Commonwealth Builder Clubs. And then, of course, you recall that in that earlier period, 1933, there was a change of political administration due to a national election. And in that period there were a group of young, ambitious politicians who wanted to get elected to public office. There were many young aspiring graduates of college who felt that they had a contribution to make, and they sought audiences before these respective organizations to win political favor, make speeches and otherwise become publicly known so that when they did choose to file as a candidate for public office that they could expect enough support to get elected.

These Commonwealth Builders ultimately merged and formed what was known as the Washington Commonwealth Federation.

MR. TAVENNER. Was there anything of a Communist origin that you know of in the establishment of the Commonwealth Builders?

MR. DENNETT. No. To the best of my knowledge, this was a result of the efforts of people who were not directed or led by the Communist Party. However, their efforts met with such sweeping success that the Communist Party had to concern itself if it was going to remain a political factor.

MR. TAVENNER. In other words, the Communist Party in order to become the leader in the field which it desired, would have to get control of such organizations. Is that what you mean?

MR. DENNETT. Absolutely. We recognized that. And since being pushed into leadership in various activities in the city, it fell to me to do a lot of this representative work of the Communist Party in the ranks of the Washington Commonwealth Federation, because the prestige I had in the Inland Boatmen's Union as a result of the successful strike made it a comparatively simple matter for the members to elect me a delegate and be a bona fide representative of a bona fide labor union in the Washington Commonwealth Federation.

MR. TAVENNER. Without going into detail, will you tell us what the connection was, between the Commonwealth Builders and the Washington Commonwealth Federation, or how one may have succeeded the other?

MR. DENNETT. The Commonwealth Builders were the groups of small organizations which preceded the Washington Commonwealth Federation. The Communist Party became interested in the success of Commonwealth Builders and brought forth some proposals to cause the organization to expand and grow.

One of the proposals of the Communist Party was that steps should be taken by the Commonwealth Builders to make possible the affiliation not only of neighborhood groups alone—

MR. TAVENNER. Neighborhood groups of what?

MR. DENNETT. Of either Democrats or Commonwealth Builders, or unemployed organizations or Workers Alliance. There are still a few remnants of those, remnants of the old Unemployed Citizens League organizations. These had all transformed and became the foundation upon which the Commonwealth Builders rested.

The Communist Party, however, conceived that if the organization were to become as powerful as it should and ought to be, that provision should be made for the affiliation of larger organizations. And the Communist Party succeeded in prevailing upon most of its members to enter the American Federation of Labor unions. Consequently it was a simple matter to introduce resolutions in numerous labor unions urging that the American Federation of Labor unions affiliate with the Washington Commonwealth Federation. At the same time they proposed the calling of a convention to broaden the base of the organization of this Commonwealth Builders.

That was done. And the Washington Commonwealth Federation was brought into existence as an organization with affiliation from large numbers of unions in addition to Democratic clubs and unemployed clubs and fraternal organizations. Anything and everything which was willing to affiliate was certainly welcomed and urged to affiliate to the organization, pay dues, participate in its conventions, participate in the electoral activities it engaged in.

Mr. TAVENNER. The method that the Communist Party used to assist in the organization of the Washington Commonwealth Federation was to induce the leadership of the particular organizations which they were members of, such as the various labor organizations that you mentioned—

Mr. DENNETT. They would raise perfectly legitimate reasons which any ordinary person would recognize as proper.

Mr. TAVENNER. And they brought their influence to bear on the formation of the organization through that method.

Mr. DENNETT. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a result of that action did you say a convention was held?

Mr. DENNETT. A convention of the Commonwealth Builders was held, which changed the name to Washington Commonwealth Federation.

(At this point Representative Harold H. Velde left the hearing room.)

Mr. DENNETT. Because of that affiliation of whole organizations which were not geographical in nature—take a labor union: It was not geographical in nature; it was a complete affiliate without having geographical definition whereas a Democratic club in a particular district or a particular part of the city was restricted to a particular area.

I say the federation part became a necessary part of the title because of the nature of the changed affiliations.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before the name was changed what was the title?

Mr. DENNETT. Commonwealth Builders.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, it was a conversion of Commonwealth Builders into an overall organization.

Mr. DENNETT. It was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Titled "Washington Commonwealth Federation."

Mr. DENNETT. That is true.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will stand in recess for approximately 5 minutes.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

(Representatives Moulder and Velde were present upon reconvening at the expiration of the recess.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dennett, I think you have made it clear in your testimony that the Commonwealth Builders were not organized by the Communist Party and that there was very little, if any, Communist Party influence within those affiliated organizations as such. Am I correct in that?

Mr. DENNETT. Well, that is essentially correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to be certain as to what the picture is with regard to the Washington Commonwealth Federation which succeeded; that is, whether or not at the inception of that organization it was heavily controlled by the Communist Party.

Mr. DENNETT. No; it was not. And, as a matter of fact, it was quite anti-Communist at the very beginning.

Mr. TAVENNER. The original method used by the Communist Party to become entrenched in the federation was through the various organizations which were affiliated with it.

Mr. DENNETT. Through the process of building the organization larger and bringing into affiliation organizations in which it did have influence and ultimately getting top influence in the WCF.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think that explains it.

You made reference to a convention that was being called. When and where was the convention held? That is, the convention of the Washington Commonwealth Federation.

Mr. DENNETT. In the year 1936 it held two conventions. One was in April and another one was later in the year. The one in April was concerned with several important questions. It was the largest convention of any of the WCF conventions that I ever attended, and I understood it was the largest convention ever held. It was in Everett, Wash., in April 1936.

It must be remembered that 1936 was a Presidential campaign. The political situation in the whole country was quite alive. Many new people were rising in the political sphere. And, of course, the Washington Commonwealth Federation was an open and ready instrument through which ambitious political persons could make their first bid for public office and fame.

Many of them did so. Many young graduates of the university did so. I have very little personal knowledge about them, and I wish to make sure that you understand, and everyone else does, that I am not referring to these persons as Communists. They are not. And I make no inference of that kind. I simply recite the fact that here was an organization which was capable of exerting a great deal of political power, and it attracted all persons who had political ambitions. As a matter of fact, there were some Republicans as well as Democrats and Independents who beat a path to the door of the Washington Commonwealth Federation to obtain political endorsement.

Now this convention in 1936, in April, had before it several important policy questions. At that particular time the Communist Party had to exercise its influence by indirection. The top leadership of the federation were not Communists at that time.

The Communist Party was striving to obtain an endorsement of that federation convention which would call for the organization of either a farmer-labor party or a new independent political party. In other words, our effort, speaking of the Communists, was to drive the federation into making a completely new, independent, separate political organization. However, our plans were dependent upon approval from the central committee of the Communist Party. And the central committee of the Communist Party kept us dangling on the end of a string for many, many weeks prior to the opening of this convention.

The reason they kept us dangling on a string was that nationally the Communist Party wanted to see organized and wanted to have a part in organizing a new national organization which would be separate from and independent from the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. And it hoped to attract all persons known as liberals or progressives to support and participate in such an organization. But its chief difficulty was to obtain some national figure of great prominence to lead the thing to give it the initiative and give it the original sendoff that it needed to draw the strength necessary to win something in the next election.

The party leadership felt that the person most capable of accomplishing that purpose and fulfilling that objective was the then Governor of Minnesota. I think it is Minnesota. Yes. His name was Floyd Olson. He was Governor there. And he was a Farmer-Labor Governor there.

The very designation lent itself to the spreading of a nationwide farmer-labor party. And it was the original hope of the Communist Party that through various forms of manipulation—

It was the Olson from Minnesota. I am quite sure, thinking back on it now, it was Floyd.

But be that as it may, it was the Governor Olson of Minnesota who was Governor in 1936 as a Farmer-Labor Governor.

However, at the very last moment when we had the resolution all ready to press before the convention, we finally received word that this Governor Olson was not well enough to undertake the job of organizing a new national farmer-labor party because of ill health, and begged off from the responsibility. Nationally, we were unable to find another figure of as much prominence whom we thought would be capable of leading such a successful effort. Consequently, we had to whip our party machinery into shape rather rapidly and change our tactics right on the floor of the WCF convention, and reverse ourselves in the process of debating the question.

Actually the resolutions committee had come in with a report in which a majority had objected to going the independent route. But I was one of the delegates who was in the minority who was leading a fight for going the independent route. And in the process of starting the debate we got the official word that it was a hopeless task, and we had to withdraw that effort.

We made a last-minute switch in our strategy and tactics, and some of those who had been fighting us so vigorously on the floor were completely dumfounded to find that we compromised—what appeared to be a compromise—when we changed our policy during the course of the debate on the resolution itself and withdrew our minority position.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you change your policy as a result of directions from the Communist Party head in New York?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes. And the district organizer of the party was in the anteroom of the convention hall, sending word and direction to those of us who were up near the microphone who had an opportunity to command the microphone and the debate. And there were runners running back and forth to us rather rapidly telling us what the latest news of the party line was.

And the executive secretary of the Commonwealth Federation at that time was a man by the name of Howard Costigan who became somewhat alarmed to see such an obvious maneuver where between 15 and 20 different people were running back and forth passing messages to me and to others up in the front from Rappaport advising us what the official party policy was. He later on commented that he could see the party line running all over the place, but he didn't know what was in it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Howard Costigan a member of the Communist Party at that time?

Mr. DENNETT. Not at that time.

But that demonstration of power that we exercised in that convention was very convincing to him that if he wanted to remain as head of that organization he would have to make his peace with us, which he did before that summer was over.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did he become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. He did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the record should show that Mr. Howard Costigan has appeared before the committee and has testified regarding some of the matters which have been mentioned here, including the fact that he did become a member of the Communist Party at about the time indicated by this witness, and at a later time, at approximately 1940, he left the Communist Party.

Mr. DENNETT. I could substantiate that.

There was another matter which arose as a serious issue in that convention, and it concerned a proposal for an initiative measure which became known as the production-for-use initiative.

Many people, because of the Communist Party influence in the unemployed days, were quite concerned and alarmed over the problem of unemployment, insecurity, possible impoverishment, et cetera. All the consequences of economic dislocation. They had read many of the so-called utopian pieces of literature such as Bellamy's Looking Backward and other documents of the kind. They had also read Mr. Upton Sinclair's program in California. They were somewhat acquainted with the propaganda of the Soviet Union, to the effect that production-for-use was the solution to the problems of capitalist lack of planning. In other words, planned economy.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Dennett, you testified that you received the party line by courier, by runners from Rappaport. Do you have any idea how Rappaport received it from headquarters of the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes. Sometimes he received it by telegraph. In this particular instance, about this Governor Olson, he received that by telegram.

Mr. VELDE. Was there any secrecy involved, especially at that time?

Mr. DENNETT. No; there was no secrecy in that communication. As a matter of fact, they took parallel measures to see that somebody in Governor Olson's staff also sent word to Howard Costigan directly. He also received the word. So that there was parallel information. At least we did make that concession to Costigan, that he would have official information about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the rank-and-file membership of the Washington Commonwealth Federation know of the Communist Party manipulations which you have just described?

Mr. DENNETT. I am quite sure that most of them did not, although the behavior of many of the Democratic Party leaders at that convention would lead me to believe that they suspected it, because they fought us so bitterly and so hard.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed, please.

Mr. DENNETT. The story on the production-for-use initiative is simply this:

Because there was such a popular demand for some change in the economic situation to assure continued production and a cooperative effort, many people tried to translate an ideal of a cooperative commonwealth into some form of legislative effort. This resulted in many conferences and the calling in of legal talent to try to draft a measure which would be legal and which would satisfy the ambitions of the people to have the so-called dream of a cooperative commonwealth organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Describe in a practical sense what production-for-use meant?

Mr. DENNETT. I wish I could satisfy you completely on that point because that is one of the problems we ran into in trying to draw up this initiative measure.

We could never satisfy ourselves that we had it satisfactorily organized. However, the staff who worked on it worked long and hard and finally produced a measure which was known as the production-for-use initiative. It was ready for presentation to that convention. However, some of us in the Communist Party, while we agreed that such a measure was a good propaganda weapon and felt that it was an excellent means of popularizing the ideas which we understood and claimed were the basis of the operation of the economy in the Soviet Union, we were startled when we read the document and found that it sounded a little bit more like the Fascist corporate state that the Italian leader Mussolini had established. We became so alarmed about it, and were so perplexed that we asked a very world-famous person, who happened to be a guest of the convention, what this person thought about it.

The person to whom I refer is Anna Louise Strong, who had just come from the Soviet Union, extended greetings to us, to the convention, and otherwise gave a very enlightening report on her travels, and won wide acclaim for that effort.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did she, on the floor of the convention, address herself to the problem of production-for-use?

Mr. DENNETT. She did not. Not at that moment. She spoke only in general terms about it, referring to it in a complimentary way and hoping for success. But at that moment she did not know very much about what was in that document.

However, we felt that she, coming from the Soviet Union with fresh knowledge, might know quite a lot about it and might be able to assist us in revising the document so that it would be possible to satisfy us that it was, in fact, a step in the direction of a cooperative commonwealth.

So she consented very graciously to take the document and work on it overnight. She did exactly that. And we read it the next morning, and, much to our surprise, she had moved the emphasis in the control even more in the direction of top control and less in the direction of allowing the members or the organizations to have anything to say about it, which was just the reverse of the trend that we had hoped for.

Consequently, we began to ask ourselves, that is, the Communists asked themselves, if this is the end result of an effort to draw up an initiative, maybe it would be smarter politically for us to see that this measure dies aborning. Consequently, we came to the conclusion that it was impossible to draw up an initiative measure which would be adequate and which would answer our propaganda needs and our desires to satisfy us that it was in harmony with our program. So we embarked upon a campaign in the course of the election—

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this a campaign to pass the proposed measure or to defeat it?

Mr. DENNETT. Well, we all went out presumably to win support to get the measure adopted. That is, it was an initiative measure and it was before the voters. The voters were to cast a vote yes or no on this initiative.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DENNETT. My counsel asked me if I knew the number of it, and I have forgotten the exact number of that initiative at this moment. So I can't furnish that. I wish I could. It is a matter of official record, however, and it can be verified if anyone is curious about it.

The Communist Party found itself in that predicament. We were committed to support the measure, but we were determined to bring about its defeat. Consequently, we campaigned far and wide all over the State of Washington, explaining the measure in such a way as to convince the people that they should not vote for it.

At the same time we represented ourselves as campaigning for the measure.

And we did it so successfully that the measure was defeated. If we hadn't of done it I am afraid it would have been adopted.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DENNETT. My counsel asked me who was the "we."

I am referring to the Communist Party in that instance.

The leaders of the Washington Commonwealth Federation were terribly disturbed by the nature of the campaign that we were carrying on, that is, the Communists.

Mr. TAVENNER. I should think it would be a rather confusing campaign where the Communist Party, in order to defeat it, actually supported it.

Mr. DENNETT. That is true. It was very confusing to everyone, even to us at times.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is a very interesting thing. The Communist Party, in order to defeat this measure, went out and conducted a statewide campaign in favor of it. But in order to accomplish its defeat, if I understand you correctly, the Communist Party so represented the issues that people would be bound to vote against it.

Mr. DENNETT. That is true.

Mr. MOULDER. I understood the situation to be that because of Communist Party support of the measure, the public sentiment opposed it.

Mr. DENNETT. Not necessarily so, sir, because they didn't know that we who were speaking were Communists. They thought we were representatives of the Washington Commonwealth Federation.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed.

Mr. DENNETT. There is triple deception in this maneuver, which is rather hard to follow. I hope I have explained it.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am afraid that the point may not be absolutely clear in the record, and I want to be sure that it is clear:

If I understand you correctly, it was not the fact that the Communist Party was supporting this measure that caused its defeat.

Mr. DENNETT. You are correct, sir. That was not the reason. It was the way we, as disguised Communists, carried on the campaign, ostensibly for it, but, in fact, against it.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, your representations were of such a character as to make known the weaknesses in the bill; and a person would actually think you were supporting it.

Mr. DENNETT. True. You understand it quite clearly.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think the bill was properly named when you used the word "initiative" because that certainly is the use of initiative.

I am glad to know it is Communist Party initiative. It is a very deceptive type of campaign.

Mr. DENNETT. Mr. Tavenner and Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one observation about my testimony earlier this afternoon.

I get the feeling, and I have a fear that perhaps people listening to this presentation might think that because of my testimony I was the only figure who was active in the Washington Commonwealth Federation carrying on this activity.

I hope that no one assumes that because I was one of a team. There were several others.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who composed the team?

Mr. DENNETT. Well, I didn't mean to bring that up because I don't like to have to do that. But I was fearful that people might think I was too much of a braggart in this thing, and I don't mean to be because it is all ancient history and I am simply trying to furnish such information as I know of my own knowledge about that experience so that other people may comprehend it in full.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am sure, Mr. Dennett, that the committee, having heard as many witnesses as it has on the subject of communism, recognizes that it is teamwork that has enabled the Communist Party to get where it is, rather than grandstand playing.

Who were the other members of the team?

Mr. DENNETT. Well, that takes me into a description of the district bureau of the Communist Party in that particular period.

As I look back over it I might call it the golden age of the Communist Party's efforts in the Northwest because it did at that time enjoy, that is, the leaders of the Communist Party did enjoy a relationship among each other and among themselves, and in the organizations to which each were members—they did enjoy a very full and rich democratic experience in procedure.

This, I think, was due largely to the efforts of Mr. Morris Rappaport who was the district organizer whom I mentioned earlier, who had, by his adroitness in calling the political moves, established himself in the eyes of the central committee of the Communist Party of the United States as a person capable of directing the political activities in the Northwest without the need of daily supervision on the part of national headquarters of the Communist Party. In other words, they did accord him the recognition that comes of confidence that he knew what he was doing and was capable of carrying it out.

And I am quite certain that the way he coordinated the efforts of each of us in the district bureau at that time were so gratifying to the central committee that most of the members of the central committee didn't dare to try to interfere with our efforts for fear that they might be responsible for upsetting the applecart so to speak.

Now in that team were, first of all, Mr. Morris Rappaport, the district organizer. His right-hand man, who was also the trade-union secretary of the district, was a man known to me by the name of Henry or Harry Jackson. I know that that is not his real name, but I do not know what his real name was. That was his party name. That is the only name I knew him by in this area.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long was he in this area?

Mr. DENNETT. He came shortly after Morris Rappaport came.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he come from New York?

Mr. DENNETT. He did. His original home was San Francisco.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am sure we know him.

Mr. DENNETT. Mr. Jackson had his early training in the Marine Workers Industrial Union organizing maritime workers. He came here originally for that purpose, and then his assignment was switched to that of trade-union secretary for the district in the Northwest.

I was one of his closest associates because I was footloose and free and available to carry the Jimmy Higgins load that had to be carried at that time. We were working daily and devoting all of our time to that effort.

We had a few people who were prominent in the University of Washington at that time who were active members of our district bureau. One was Mr. Harold Ebey, E-b-e-y.

And another was Mr. Hugh DeLacy.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he at one time a Member of Congress?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, he is the same person who was called as a witness before this committee at Dayton, Ohio, in September 1954, and who refused to answer material questions on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate him.

Mr. DENNETT. I mentioned Mr. DeLacy's name with a great deal of regret because I was a very close associate of Mr. DeLacy and I had a great deal of respect for him, and he for me. It is only under the compulsion of the subpoena and the fact that I am testifying and I have to testify when I mention his name. I do so with regret. I wish the rules were such that it wasn't necessary because it is a source of great embarrassment to me. But I feel that I owe a big obligation to the men that I work for, and, under the rules as constituted by this committee and the way it is operating, I have no choice in the matter.

I make my apologies to Mr. DeLacy for having to do this. I regret it. But at the same time, in the long run, I don't think it is going to hurt him, and I think it may do him some good. I hope so.

Others who were prominent in the district bureau were, of course, Mr. Howard Costigan, Mr. Jess Fletcher, Mr. William K. Dobbins, Mr. Karley Larsen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me make this suggestion to you.

If you know whether any of these persons whose names you have mentioned, testified publicly before this or other committees and acknowledged their Communist Party membership and a withdrawal from the Communist Party, I think you should state it.

Mr. DENNETT. I can state that about three persons whom I know. I know that Mr. Jess Fletcher separated from the Communist Party, and he has testified in a number of instances. He began testifying before the Canwell committee when he was separated from the Communist Party and from his union as a consequence of that fight. He later testified before a number of Government agencies in a number of court cases.

Mr. Howard Costigan testified before this committee. I read his testimony in the proceedings which have been published by the committee.

Mr. Harold Ebey also appeared before the Canwell committee and testified there. He is out of the Communist Party and has been for quite a considerable period of time. At least, I believe, since this period 1936, 1937, and 1938.

Costigan is out of the Communist Party. He left shortly after later political difficulties arose, which I will soon get into.

There may have been a few others who were in and out of the district bureau. This district bureau was the leading body, the leading organ in the district. It was the top body which had the top authority to determine party policy in this area.

At one time I believe there were about 12 or 14 members of this bureau. It may have been confined to nine. I have some recollection that there were nine members officially on the bureau, but there were a few who were candidates. That is, they were the next alternates to become members in the event of any vacancy on the bureau so that we could always have a reserve to fill any vacancies which might occur.

That district bureau covered the Northwest area which were the States of, at that time, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Alaska.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand you to mean that it was that group of individuals who took the leadership in the work within the Washington Commonwealth Federation?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes; they did.

Mr. Rappaport could not directly participate in the work of the Washington Commonwealth Federation because he was what was generally called the face of the party. He was the official representative of the party. And the Washington Commonwealth Federation, even though there were Communist leaders in it, it at no time accepted an affiliation from the Communist Party, and it at no time would acknowledge a Communist as a Communist in the organization unless it be someone like Rappaport who had the authority to represent the party as such.

By that I mean that if I presented myself to the Washington Commonwealth Federation to speak on any matter or to urge anything before its body, I could not speak in the name of the Communist Party even though other members of that executive board may know that I was a member of the Communist Party. I could not speak as a Communist. I could only speak as a member of that executive board, and it was the presumption that I was representing the affiliate from which I had been sent as a delegate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, which of these Communist Party bureau members became officials in the Washington Commonwealth Federation.

Mr. DENNETT. Mr. Costigan already was an official. He was the executive secretary.

Mr. DeLacy became the president of the Washington Commonwealth Federation.

I became the vice president of the Washington Commonwealth Federation.

Mr. Harold Ebey served in some advisory capacity. I think that he came from a teachers' union affiliate at that time.

Mr. Dobbins was a member there, but I do not recall the exact relation that he held to obtain his position.

Mr. Karley Larsen was a leader there by virtue of the fact that he was a leader in the Northern Washington District Council of the International Woodworkers of America.

Mr. TAVENNER. It would seem that the Communist Party had complete control of the organization.

Mr. DENNETT. We had another person there who is now deceased, but I don't think that it gives a complete picture without mentioning him, and that is Mr. William Pennock, because Bill Pennock was the workhorse. Bill Pennock carried the load. He was a very efficient man, one of the fastest shorthand artists that I ever knew, and was capable of keeping up with the fast pace that Mr. Costigan set.

Mr. Pennock deserves honorable mention for the work that he did in that setup.

Mr. TAVENNER. What position did Pennock hold in the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. He attended the bureau meetings, but I do not remember exactly whether he was a member of the bureau. But he attended most of the bureau meetings by virtue of the fact that he became the head of the pension union which was one of the big affiliates of the Washington Commonwealth Federation.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have given a very full description of how the Communist Party maneuvered to capture this organization.

Why was the Communist Party so interested in obtaining control of the Washington Commonwealth Federation?

Mr. DENNETT. Because we wanted to ultimately obtain political power for the Communist Party in the United States of America.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. In the same manner, I assume, that you were attempting to gain power for the Communist Party in every other field of endeavor.

Mr. DENNETT. Of course.

My counsel has suggested that I indicate the total membership of the Washington Commonwealth Federation in that period.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, I think you should.

Mr. DENNETT. I am unable to give that in exact numbers, but I can give you a proportionate situation which may indicate something of value.

It was our estimate and the result of our study from the election returns of the candidates that we endorsed and the propositions that we supported—

Mr. TAVENNER. When you say "we" are you speaking of the Communist Party or the Washington Commonwealth?

Mr. DENNETT. The Washington Commonwealth Federation.

It was our estimate that it was capable of influencing and obtaining the vote of one-third of the members who voted in the Democratic Party slate or side of the ticket. And because of that fact and because we were in a higher state of mobilization than the rest of the Democratic Party, when primaries came along we could exercise a more direct influence in the primaries than anybody else because our members in the Washington Commonwealth Federation had a greater zeal and a greater devotion to carrying out their objectives than the other Democrats who frequently relied upon making their decisions in the general elections.

Mr. MOULDER. What do you mean by other Democrats?

Mr. DENNETT. Those who voted in the Democratic Party who were not members of the Washington Commonwealth Federation through affiliation.

Mr. MOULDER. How many Communists would you estimate were members of the Washington Commonwealth Federation?

Mr. DENNETT. The nearest I can give you by indication of that is that in the period 1937-38, the high point of membership in the Communist Party, as I recall the reports made to the district bureau by the organization secretary, was in the neighborhood of 5,500 members of the Communist Party in the Northwest, in the 3 States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and Alaska, the Territory of Alaska. Those 5,500 members of course, were scattered throughout all the other organizations in the Northwest. And I am firmly of the belief that fully 90 to 95 percent of that were members of the Washington Commonwealth Federation through affiliations of one kind or another.

(At this point Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Washington Commonwealth Federation extend throughout the entire 12th district, or, that is, in the Northwest area? Or was it confined only to the State of Washington?

Mr. DENNETT. It was confined to the State of Washington. However, there were some efforts made in the State of Oregon to develop an Oregon Commonwealth Federation, but I have no direct knowledge of that, and I would be unqualified to give you any testimony about it because I did not participate in it and I do not know the people who did.

Mr. VELDE (presiding). Did your district committee of the Communist Party, however, have representatives from Alaska and from Oregon?

Mr. DENNETT. No, there was no territorial representation like that. The representatives of the district bureau of the Communist Party were chosen because of their capability as political leaders, not because of any particular area that they came from. And it was determined largely by their ability to influence public opinion and to intervene in the decision of public affairs.

Mr. VELDE. Did the district bureau act for the 12th district of the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes, it did.

Mr. VELDE. But were they all from the State of Washington?

Mr. DENNETT. That is true. I think perhaps it is necessary at this point to clear up one little problem of organizational structure that existed in the Communist Party at that time.

It was not based upon territory. Representatives of the higher committees did not have to come from any particular territory. They were chosen because of their availability and their influencing ability to carry the party policy into the mass organizations or before the public.

Mr. VELDE. Were they actually chosen by the national committee of the Communist Party.

Mr. DENNETT. Not in this district they were not, no.

Mr. VELDE. Just how were they chosen?

Mr. DENNETT. Well, that is another organizational problem of interorganization of the Communist Party which is rather difficult for persons not familiar with it to comprehend. But let me try to do it as briefly as possible this way.

When I first came into the Communist Party the usual procedure was something that went under the title of "Cooption." Cooption meant that the district organizer could appoint anybody he wanted to the district committee or to the district bureau and could call them

in to serve, and everybody else had to accept such a person as being a fully qualified member of that body. In other words, it was a handpicked staff which represented the wishes of that particular leader who held the authority at that time. That was the process of cooption in the event of a vacancy. He could appoint someone to fill that vacancy, and he did so. It was his responsibility to do so.

However, with the rise of Hitler Germany, the trials of the Reichstag, an international leader by the name of Dimitrov acquired world fame because, in his defense against the frameup which Goering tried to put over on him, he learned that the Communist tactics and the Communist policies in Germany had turned the masses of German workers against the Communist Party and had resulted or had certainly played a part in contributing to making it possible for Hitler Germany to result with Hitler's ascension to power.

Therefore, Mr. Dimitrov, when offered asylum by the Soviet Government, immediately went to work for the Comintern, and, in that capacity as leader of the Comintern, brought forth what was known as a new line. And that new line called for introducing the practice of democracy into the ranks of the Communist Party organization. He urged and advised that the practice of cooption be abolished, and that the higher committees be elected by a democratic process. And he, in fact, insisted that that must be done in all countries where the party was not illegal.

Recognizing that it was not possible to hold conventions where the party was illegal, and that applied especially to the United States, when Mr. Rappaport came to this district he tried his best to follow out the decisions which were laid down by the Communist International and the national headquarters of the Communist Party, and that practice of electing the leadership was followed. However, at the district convention there was always a nominating committee who carefully screened the names of persons who were being proposed for leadership or election to these committees, and, in doing so, succeeded in accomplishing the original result, only satisfying ourselves that we were practicing democracy.

Mr. VELDE. What year did that change take place, Mr. Dennett?

Mr. DENNETT. Right around 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. So the matter of making nominations through a committee was a mere matter of form.

(At this point Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. DENNETT. The district organizers still carefully looked it over and still had a controlling influence there. But in this particular case Mr. Rappaport exercised his influence not in any arbitrary way but in a convincing way, because we all recognized that his broader experience and his tremendous capacity for work equipped him to give us the benefit of better wisdom than we had.

Mr. TAVENNER. Going back to the Washington Commonwealth Federation, you were asked a question as to what the membership of the Communist Party was in the district. Do you know what the membership of the Communist Party was in the State of Washington at that time?

Mr. DENNETT. Well, most of that membership was in the State of Washington. And I don't know the exact number, but I think it would be quite safe to say that around 85 to 90 percent of it was in the State of Washington.

MR. TAVENNER. How long did the Communist Party succeed in bringing its influence to bear on political elections through this organization known as the Washington Commonwealth Federation?

MR. DENNETT. Until the international situation became unstable in about the year 1938.

MR. TAVENNER. How did the international situation affect political matters locally here in the State of Washington as far as the Communist Party was concerned?

MR. DENNETT. The Communist Party had as one of its principal objectives and one of its chief propaganda weapons, which it used upon other persons of political mindedness, that the Communist program was a consistent program on a domestic policy and on foreign policy, that our program was liberal domestically and liberal internationally. However, in 1938, after a long period of struggle and effort, the Communist Party succeeded in prevailing upon many people to accept the slogan of collective security as the proper policy to pursue in foreign affairs. That, of course, was quite consistent with the policy of the Soviet Union because it was the Soviet delegates to the League of Nations who had continually agitated for a policy of collective security.

I think it was some time in 1938 that the Italian Premier launched his attack in Ethiopia, and while we were clamoring for collective security to be applied to that situation, it wasn't too long afterwards when the Soviet Union had a serious dispute with Finland, and hostilities broke out and the Soviet Union smashed the Finnish Army and the Finnish military installations.

We were confronted with the necessity of making an immediate switch demanding nonintervention.

MR. TAVENNER. What do you mean by we?

MR. DENNETT. The Communist Party.

So our insistence upon nonintervention contradicted our prior insistence upon collective security. This presented no end of trouble, especially to those who had to meet the public and had to answer to the public for the consistency of their program and policies from one day to the next. It ultimately led to the disaffection of Mr. Howard Costigan. And the chief reason that Mr. Costigan disaffected at that time was because of his loyalty to Franklin D. Roosevelt as then President of the United States, who came out in bitter denunciation against the Soviets for attacking Finland, which left him in the position of having a consistent policy because he had complained bitterly against Mussolini's march into Ethiopia. He had also been critical of the Japanese invasion of China. He had also been critical of each military venture where one country had attempted to impose its will upon another by military means.

So Costigan felt that he was on sounder ground to continue his support of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and he did so with as much effort as he dared, without bringing down the wrath of the Communist Party on him at that particular moment. However, the Communist Party sensed that he was beginning to disaffect, and we proceeded to isolate him from everything we could. I mean the Communists proceeded to isolate Mr. Costigan.

MR. TAVENNER. Was this the period when the Communist Party was crying from the rooftops that the President of the United States was a warmonger?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes, it was. I am a little bit fearful that if anyone looks at the record very carefully they will find that I made a few speeches on that subject myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, as a result of the international situation the Communist Party had gotten itself into a position which adversely affected its interests locally.

Mr. DENNETT. That is very true.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the result of that adverse effect upon the Communist Party locally?

Mr. DENNETT. The most damaging effect to the Communist Party was that it shook the faith of many of those who were members of the district bureau at that time. I must admit that I tried to present the appearance myself of not losing faith in the integrity of the Soviet foreign policy. However, I must also admit that there was a little bit of deception in that for the reason that I could not completely justify it, no matter how hard I tried, and I found that Mr. Costigan became very bitter about it. I found also that Mr. Ebey had a few misgivings. He didn't express them at that time too sharply because he is a very mild-mannered sort of person. But those of us who were in the rough and tough political battles put on a case-hardened outward appearance which was intended to inspire the ranks to hold the line.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the final result?

Mr. DENNETT. The final result was that various organizations affiliated to the Washington Commonwealth Federation found their political conviction to be inconsistent with the official policy expressed by disguised Communist leaders in the Washington Commonwealth Federation. So that many of them began to disaffiliate and leave the organization, so that it did not embrace the commanding minority which it had previously had.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, your position of control in that organization was weakened, if not virtually destroyed, by this disaffection that had arisen within the Communist Party ranks largely as a result of international problems.

Mr. DENNETT. That is very true.

Those of us who presented what might be referred to as a case-hardened outward appearance did so largely in the hope and faith that our loyalty to the Soviet Union under those circumstances would be rewarded by the Soviet Union remaining loyal and true to the socialist ideals which all of us held.

However, at a later date, after the Second World War, just to make the comment without going into detail at this moment, many began to find out through their experience in the Army and military efforts, and through persons who traveled abroad and came into contact directly with the Russian military effort—many became convinced that there was a considerable difference between the democracy that had been preached about in the Soviet Union and the actual practice which they found.

Also there was a serious disillusionment when large numbers of soldiers learned, to their dismay, that even during the war period the Soviet Union had in labor camps very large numbers of persons who were held in those camps as political prisoners, a policy which we had been led to believe, through all the official propaganda, that

the Communist Party in the Soviet Union wouldn't possibly indulge in such a practice, that only the capitalist countries would practice such a heinous crime.

But it was a terrible shock and disillusionment when large numbers of people found, out of their own direct knowledge, that these huge forced labor camps did in fact exist and that people who were committed to them were committed to them for terms ranging from 25 years to life instead of the official propaganda which has been preached, to the effect that no sentence was over 10 years in length in the Soviet Union. And we found there was a great deal of difference between fact and fancy.

(At this point Representative Harold H. Velde left the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Is the Washington Commonwealth Federation in existence today?

Mr. DENNETT. It is not. It was liquidated by the Communist Party leadership during the Second World War.

In my records there will be found some correspondence between Hugh DeLacy and myself because I was a vice president of the federation, but I was in the military service at the time this disillusion took place.

Mr. DeLacy had written me something about it, and I disagreed with it. He had also written to me suggesting that since I was in the military service maybe it would be better for me to give up my share of stock which entitled me to be a member of the board of directors of the New World, which was the official newspaper published under the federation at that time.

I found occasion to disagree violently with him over the suggestion for the reason that I felt that those who were in the armed services should not be removed from their official positions because they were in the armed services. I felt that they were more entitled to continue their representation on the organization because they were in the armed services.

We had an exchange of correspondence there which was quite acrimonious at points, and I am amazed when I look back at it and see how it developed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a satisfactory point to suspend the examination of this witness.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, Mr. Dennett. We thank you for your patience and the information which you have given the committee. We are endeavoring, whenever possible, to give you a rest so there will not be this long stress upon you for a long period of time.

Mr. DENNETT. I appreciate that. In my younger days I used to have a marathon endurance, but I find I don't have it any more.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you wish to call another witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Lawrence Earl George.

Mr. MOULDER. Will you hold up your right hand and be sworn, please.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. GEORGE. I do.

TESTIMONY OF LAWRENCE EARL GEORGE, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, PHILIP L. BURTON

Mr. WHEELER. Will the witness state his full name, please?

Mr. GEORGE. My name is Lawrence Earl George.

Mr. WHEELER. Where do you reside?

Mr. GEORGE. Seattle, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Will counsel identify himself for the record, please?

Mr. BURTON. My name is Philip L. Burton. I am a Seattle attorney.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. George, what is your occupation?

Mr. GEORGE. I am a warehouseman, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. How long have you been a warehouseman?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, for 12, 15 years; 12 years anyway.

Mr. WHEELER. Being a warehouseman, are you a member of any union?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. Sir, upon advice of counsel, I will invoke my rights and privileges under the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MOULDER. I didn't hear your reply. Did you say you decline to answer the question?

Mr. GEORGE. Because of certain insinuations about any union, it is necessary for me to invoke my rights under the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution and decline to answer the question.

Mr. WHEELER. Have you held any positions in the union that we are discussing?

Mr. GEORGE. Again, sir, I shall have to invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Is it not a fact that the warehousemen are members of the International Longshoreman's and Warehousemen's Union? I am not asking you if you are a member of the ILWU; just a blanket question.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; that is a fact.

Mr. WHEELER. Are you a member of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. Again, sir, I have to invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Have you at any time during your residency in Seattle been acquainted with a lady by the name of Barbara Hartle?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. Again, sir, I shall have to invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mrs. Hartle testified before this committee last June that she knew you as a member of the waterfront section of the Communist Party. Is that correct?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. Again, Mr. Chairman, I have to invoke the privileges granted me under the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. WHEELER. Will you also invoke the privilege on all questions relating to the waterfront section of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. I shall have to invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment in connection with that.

Mr. WHEELER. Were you an official of the union in 1951?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. Again I have to invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment and decline to answer the question.

Mr. WHEELER. Did you sign a Taft-Hartley affidavit?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. I invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment and decline to answer.

Mr. WHEELER. Is it not a fact that the Communist Party advised members of the Communist Party to disassociate themselves from the Communist Party and sign the Taft-Hartley affidavit?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. I shall have to invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment to that.

Mr. WHEELER. Is it not a fact that the members of the Communist Party remained loyal and in the discipline of the Communist Party although they officially did resign?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. I will have to invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment as to that.

Mr. MOULDER. Did I understand you to say that your birthplace was here in Seattle?

Mr. GEORGE. Sir, I didn't give my place of birth. I wasn't asked that question.

Mr. MOULDER. Where were you born?

Mr. GEORGE. I was born in Denver, Colo.

Mr. MOULDER. When did you move to Seattle?

Mr. GEORGE. I came to Seattle after the First World War. I think it was in 1918 or thereabouts.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you resided in Seattle ever since?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Have you ever heard of the Negro and National Groups Commission of the Communist Party of King County?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. I shall have to invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment as to that, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Mrs. Hartle in her testimony stated you were chairman of that group. Was she correct in this testimony?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. Again, sir, I will have to invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment and decline to answer.

Mr. WHEELER. Are you familiar with an organization called the Interracial Action Committee?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. I will have to invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Are you a member of the Communist Party today, Mr. George?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. GEORGE. I will have to invoke my privileges under the fifth amendment and decline to answer that, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. WHEELER. Harriet Pierce.

(At this point Representative Harold H. Velde returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. MOULDER. Do you represent Mrs. Pierce? Will you step up?

Mr. TROLSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. I want to talk to him.

(Whereupon Mr. Trolson conferred with the chairman.)

Mr. MOULDER. Call the witness again, please.

Mr. WHEELER. Harriet Pierce.

Mr. MOULDER. Would you raise your right hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. PIERCE. I do.

Mr. TROLSON. May I make a statement before you begin to question the witness?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes; you may.

Mr. TROLSON. My name is Roy Trolson. I am a member of the Board of Trustees of the Seattle Bar Association.

Mrs. Pierce has come to the bar association and rendered a statement that she is unable to secure counsel because she has no funds for that purpose. The president of the Bar Association has asked me to represent Mrs. Pierce, and I want to make it clear that I am representing her without compensation and at the request of the Legal Aid Bureau of the Seattle Bar Association.

Mr. MOULDER. We certainly appreciate your position and wish to say that you should be commended as an attorney when requested by the Bar Association to appear and represent any person who has no funds to employ counsel.

And certainly it should have no reflection, and doesn't have any reflection, upon you whatsoever.

For a person who is unable to employ counsel, it is the duty of a lawyer under those circumstances to comply with that request, and the burden that has been placed upon you.

Mr. TROLSON. Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. HARRIET PIERCE, ACCOMPANIED BY HER COUNSEL, ROY F. TROLSON

Mr. WHEELER. Will you state your full name, please?

Mrs. PIERCE. Mrs. Harriet Pierce.

Mr. WHEELER. Where do you presently reside?

Mrs. PIERCE. In Seattle.

Mr. WHEELER. Are you presently employed?

Mrs. PIERCE. Yes; I am.

Mr. WHEELER. Where are you employed?

Mrs. PIERCE. I am employed at the Takoma Country and Golf Club.

Mr. WHEELER. Do you have any part-time employment other than your present position?

Mrs. PIERCE. No; I do not.

Mr. WHEELER. Would you advise the committee of your occupational background prior to your present occupation?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PIERCE. I wish to invoke the fifth amendment on this question.

Mr. WHEELER. On all prior occupation?

Mrs. PIERCE. Yes, sir; that is on all prior occupation.

Mr. WHEELER. Isn't it a fact that you worked for the United States Government at one time?

Mrs. PIERCE. On this question, too, I wish to invoke the protection of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you mean to say that your employment in the United States Government may tend to incriminate you?

Mrs. PIERCE. I have already stated my answer, sir.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. If investigation, Mr. Wheeler, reveals the witness' employment, then I suggest that you ask the question according to what your investigation has revealed, the specific questions which she can answer.

Mr. WHEELER. Have you ever been employed by the United States Post Office Department?

Mrs. PIERCE. I decline to answer that question for the reasons previously stated, sir. And I would like to explain that I fear that answering these questions may lead to other questions which might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. WHEELER. Were you dismissed from this position because of security reasons?

Mrs. PIERCE. I decline to answer that question for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. WHEELER. Have you been a paid employee of the Civil Rights Congress of the city of Seattle?

Mrs. PIERCE. I decline to answer that question for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. WHEELER. Do you know Mrs. Barbara Hartle?

Mrs. PIERCE. I decline to answer that question, sir, for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. WHEELER. She testified that you were a member of the Georgetown Club of the Communist Party, King County. Is that a statement of fact on the part of Mrs. Hartle?

Mrs. PIERCE. I decline to answer, and invoke my protection under the fifth amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Were you active in any way with the Progressive Party here in the State of Washington?

Mrs. PIERCE. I decline to answer that for the reasons previously stated, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is quite obvious that we are not going to get the information we desire from this witness.

I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask the witness where you were born?

Mrs. PIERCE. I was born in Martinsburg, W. Va.

Mr. MOULDER. And when did you come to the State of Washington?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PIERCE. I believe it was in 1942 or possibly 1943. I am not certain.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you married at that time?

Mrs. PIERCE. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you come to Washington alone?

Mrs. PIERCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you have employment when you arrived or did you have to seek employment after you arrived?

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PIERCE. On this question, sir, I wish to invoke my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I fail to see how that could possibly tend to incriminate her or lead to incrimination. I suggest that the witness be directed to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

(The witness confers with her counsel.)

Mrs. PIERCE. Sir, this is a question which I would like very much to answer, and answer fully, but I feel that it might lead either to other questions which might incriminate me or to a waiver of my right to claim the protection of the fifth amendment, and I therefore do claim protection of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. PIERCE. Again I claim the protection of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. PIERCE. I claim the protection of the fifth amendment on that question, too.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you now employed?

Mrs. PIERCE. I have already answered that question.

Mr. MOULDER. Then would you care to answer again?

Mrs. PIERCE. Well, I could answer it again the same as I did before. I am employed now.

Mr. MOULDER. Where are you now employed?

Mrs. PIERCE. At the Tacoma Country and Golf Club.

Mr. MOULDER. How long have you been employed there?

Mrs. PIERCE. I decline to answer under the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you mean to say the length of time you have been employed there would tend to incriminate you? Is that your reasoning on that?

Mrs. PIERCE. I have already stated my answer, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

The committee will stand in recess until tomorrow morning at 9 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 4:50 p. m., the subcommittee was recessed, to be reconvened at 9 a. m., Saturday, March 19, 1955.)

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE SEATTLE, WASH., AREA

SATURDAY, MARCH 19, 1955

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Seattle, Wash.

PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 9:30 a. m., in Room 402, County-City Building, Seattle, Wash., Hon. Morgan M. Moulder (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Morgan M. Moulder (chairman) (appearance as noted) and Harold H. Velde.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel, and William A. Wheeler, staff investigator.

Mr. VELDE. The subcommittee will be in order, and we will proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to recall Mr. Eugene V. Dennett to the stand, please.

TESTIMONY OF EUGENE VICTOR DENNETT, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, KENNETH A. MacDONALD—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dennett, will you come forward, please.

When your testimony was suspended yesterday we were inquiring into the activity of the Washington Commonwealth Federation. In the course of your testimony on that subject no mention was made of the Workers Alliance.

To what extent was the Workers Alliance affiliated with that organization?

Mr. DENNETT. It was one of the principal affiliates in the early days, and it had regular representatives on the Washington Commonwealth Federation board. One of the most prominent of those was a person by the name of Harry C. Armstrong, who was better known as Army Armstrong. He later became a legislator, and I think he was at one time the head of the Workers Alliance.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the time he was head of the Workers Alliance and active in the Washington Commonwealth Federation was he also a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. At first he was not. But the Workers Alliance, of course, was one of the organizations in which the Communist Party

worked very actively, and ultimately Mr. Armstrong became a member of the Communist Party. I knew him when he was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he active in Communist Party affairs?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes, he was quite active in the Communist Party affairs for a short time. He later had differences with the party over policy, and became too much of a Democrat to suit the Communists, and came to a parting of the ways with the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us the names of any other individuals, active in the work of the Washington Commonwealth Federation or any of its component parts, who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party during that time?

Mr. DENNETT. Well, my random recollection is a little bit too unreliable to go on. I think that I mentioned all of the principal ones yesterday with the exception of Mr. Armstrong, whom I have explained this morning.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period that the organizational work was being done by the Communist Party within the Washington Commonwealth Federation was there in existence in the State of Washington an organization known as the Washington Pension Union?

Mr. DENNETT. That is correct, there was. That was a organization which came into existence principally because the Governor of the State had ordered some cuts in the pension, or the assistance to the old-age groups. It was prior to the organization of anything.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to the organization of what?

Mr. DENNETT. Of the union, of the Old-Age Pension Union.

It seems as though there was an attempt to cut on the relief, and some of the relief authorities thought that they could cut the benefits to the elderly people and there would be little protest for it. But Howard Costigan, being very alert to the political possibilities, spoke about it on the radio and, in response to that speaking, received many, many calls by telephone and by letter asking him to do something about it. He didn't know what to do.

He came to the party of people and explained to us afterward that he was perplexed but he was going to call a mass meeting and ask these people to come and make their protests in public.

He did exactly that. The meeting was overwhelming successful; far more elderly people arrived than he expected. The hall was packed to overflowing, and he had to call more meetings to satisfy their desire to express their protest. During the course of that, Costigan, not knowing what else to do, suggested that they set up a permanent committee to continue their protest against this form of relief cut. The old-age people responded so vigorously that they themselves determined that they must have a union. And they chose the name of Old-Age Pension Union.

At first, I believe, Costigan was not an officer of it. As a matter of fact, he felt that he had more than he could carry handling the work of the Washington Commonwealth Federation. So he asked the party people to find him some help to see if he could carry on this extra work that needed to be done. And, through the efforts of Mr. Lowell Wakefield, they found a person by the name of William J. Pennock who was a very able man. And Bill Pennock assisted Costigan in all of his work when he was in the Washington Commonwealth Federation.

Later when the time came to organize the Old-Age Pension Union, Pennock assisted Costigan in finding people to head up that organization.

(At this point Representative Morgan M. Moulder entered the hearing room and assumed the chair.)

Mr. DENNETT. In the very beginning the original leaders who held the original titles of president and vice president of the Old-Age Pension Union were not members of the Communist Party. They were chosen by these old-age pension people, knowing them to be public-spirited persons, and I don't know whether it is proper to identify those persons or not at this point.

Mr. TAVENNER. No. The committee would not be interested in going into that phase of the matter.

You mentioned a person by the name of Lowell Wakefield. Will you tell the committee what you know of his activities?

Mr. DENNETT. Lowell Wakefield was a member of the Communist Party. He did come from the East on his assignment by the central committee to work in this district. However, after he had worked here a comparatively short time he came into dispute with the succeeding leader who came, Mr. Morris Rappaport, and ultimately Mr. Wakefield left the Communist Party and I believe that he has had no connection with the Communist Party for a great many years.

Mr. TAVENNER. The point you are making is that in its inception this union, the Old-Age Pension Union, was not of a Communist origin or of a Communist character.

Mr. DENNETT. No; it was not. But the Communist Party recognized that the terrific response that Costigan received meant that here was a potential group of people capable of doing enormous amounts of political work.

Remember, please, their situation: They were retired; they had ceased working daily on a job. Therefore, they had the leisure time to do what they wanted to do in most instances or at least in many instances. The result was that some of these people could go out and peddle leaflets and knock on doors. They constituted an enormous political strength. And the Communist Party conceived the idea that these people certainly would be the most able people to carry on political programs if they could be won to support such a program.

So the Communist Party set about to do exactly that in the pension union.

Among those who were urged to go into the pension union to work vigorously was a person by the name of Thomas C. Rabbitt.

Tom Rabbitt became a very powerful and influential man in that organization. He did so very largely because he succeeded in being elected to the Washington State Legislature as a Democrat, and, in the State legislature as a State senator, was able to embarrass the governor and the administration on their promises to aid the elderly people on the pension program. His efforts were heralded as making a real—well, he was considered to be a real political leader because he had succeeded in a situation where it was vitally important.

My counsel reminds me that Mr. Rabbitt has been before this committee, and he appeared in your executive session last June.

Mr. Rabbitt found that there was an enormous amount of work to be done in that organization, and he had to call for help. And he built up a comparatively important machine with which he worked.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have told us that the Communist Party, upon seeing the great potentialities in this new organization, decided to do something about it. Tell the committee just what it did and the methods it used to gain control of the Old-Age Pension Union.

Mr. DENNETT. It concentrated first at the top levels of the organization. It wanted to get strong leadership there capable of carrying two important points: first, that they carry on a relentless struggle for better and more welfare assistance to the aged people so as to insure their loyalty and support among those members; they wanted, next, to be certain that a large body of people became ardent supporters and friends of the Soviet Union so that it would be possible to defend the political policies of the Communist Party in that respect and to give assistance to the Communist program in this area.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, as indicated by his testimony, the knowledge of this witness is very great concerning the scientific features of communism and how it operates in the Northwest.

Because of the limit of time, we have had to confine ourselves to the high spots. I will ask, if we are to conclude his testimony today, that Mr. Dennett confine his testimony chiefly to his own activities and circumstances surrounding them; otherwise we will be unable to complete what we had planned today.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes. As you say, it is very important testimony. We are grateful to receive it. I believe any additional information which he might wish to submit could be submitted in writing to the committee at a later date. I mean after we have concluded our hearings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious we will have a great deal of work ahead of us in connection with documentary information which he has at hand, as well as to give this witness time to explain fully the implications of his statements today.

Mr. MOULDER. It may be possible when the hearings are held in Los Angeles in June that additional hearings could be held here to complete the testimony of Mr. Dennett.

Mr. TAVENNER. Certainly further consideration will have to be given to that.

I wanted to make this explanation principally so the committee would understand that I have asked the witness to confine his testimony today principally to his own activities. I did not want the committee to feel that the witness was attempting to relate what he had done alone as a matter of his own choice.

Mr. DENNETT. Thank you.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Dennett can be subpoenaed to appear in California when hearings are held there; the subcommittee could resume hearings here at a later date if we feel it is necessary to secure his additional information.

Mr. TAVENNER. Continuing with the subject of the old-age pension, were you active in it in your individual capacity?

Mr. DENNETT. No; I was not. I spoke before it on a number of times on invitation of the leaders to indicate some labor support because I was representing the State CIO at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us briefly to what extent was the Communist Party successful in the accomplishment of the two purposes you stated the Communists had in interesting the leadership of the old-age pension unit.

Mr. DENNETT. As I indicated at the outset, the first leaders of the pension union—president, vice president, and some of the other officers—were anti-Communist people. And it did not take too long before they came into conflict with those Communists who were trying to make certain that the organization carried out these purposes which I have indicated.

I believe that the first president of the organization left it very quickly. Later on another person took over as a president of the organization, who was a member of the Communist Party, and he remained a leader for quite a long time. Ultimately he got into conflict with the Communist Party, and the Communist Party did what we call a hatchet job on him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was he?

Mr. DENNETT. A man by the name of N. P. Atkinson. And Atkinson was expelled from the party. And when he was expelled from the party he was also pushed out of the pension union.

Mr. TAVENNER. After Communist Party overtures to the leadership of the union was any effort made to capture the rank and file?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes. There was a considerable effort made. A person by the name of William J. Pennock, whom I have mentioned before, who is now deceased—Pennock was a very successful figure in this work because he was such a tireless worker.

(Representative Harold H. Velde left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. DENNETT. He worked day after day, every day, and had a very pleasing personality and was a very successful man in convincing the ordinary person that the program and policies they were pursuing were the best for the organization. And I think it should be recognized that certainly those efforts of the organization to maintain a standard of decency and comfort for public assistance for the elderly people is something which should be recognized as proper. It is something which should not be condemned because the Communists were trying to use that as a basis for successfully planting its other ideas in the ranks of the organization. And I hope no one will condemn the elderly people for trying to improve their own economic position, which they were trying to do in the pension union.

Mr. TAVENNER. How can organizations of this type, which have a very fine purpose in view, be able to accomplish their ends without permitting the Communist Party to take them over and subvert them to the purposes of the Communist Party?

What is the best defense? What defense can they have to the Communist Party which is trying to manipulate them in the manner you have described?

Mr. DENNETT. My own experience leads me to the conclusion that the soundest defense and the soundest practice which can be pursued is that wherein we all insist upon the complete observance of the fundamental principles in the Constitution of the United States and the legal procedure of the court system in the United States, in which we first insist that all persons shall be considered to be innocent until proven guilty when charged with anything which appears to be a violation of either the Constitution of the United States or the principles of the organization that they belong to.

I say that advisedly because I have had a number of experiences, personal ones, where I have been treated as a guilty person until

proven so—not in connection with Communist material either. And I observed with a great deal of interest last night's television report of Mr. Harry Cain's remarks on that very point.

Mr. Cain comes from the State of Washington. Some of us knew him rather well. And I might say that at one time he certainly impressed the people very strongly in this State because of this precise idea which he was expressing last night on TV.

And I cannot pass up the opportunity to remind all of us that it is a fundamental principle of our form of Government, of our democratic representation system, that we honor and dignify the individual as an individual for his own worth, and not completely subordinate this individual to the purpose of a mass and make him a faceless creature.

I think that each person is entitled to the individual dignity and the recognition of his right as an individual. And when he combines in an organization it is for the purpose of assisting in the further development of these human beings as creatures that are entitled to treatment as human beings.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. What is your next question, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Counsel is consulting the witness.

Mr. DENNETT. Counsel is calling my attention to the nature of your question asking what steps can be recommended, and he is trying to bring me back to that point a little more directly, and I appreciate it. I hope you will bear with us on it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me suggest this to you:

My question was not so much directed at what you mentioned as it is to this particular phase of the matter, that here is an organization which had very proper purposes: It apparently had no desire to be controlled or influenced by the Communist Party; but the Communist Party determined it was going to take it over.

Now my point is: How, from your experience in the party, could this group have successfully resisted being taken over by the Communist Party?

(At this point Representative Harold H. Velde returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. DENNETT. I think there is no one single guaranty. I think it requires a number of changes in our behavior and in our attitude in the various democratic organizations. I mean by that democratic in form; I am not referring to a party as such.

In that respect, many people in the union to which I should belong have asked me many times how could they guarantee that some untoward thing would not occur in the organization. And it has been my recommendation to them that the only guarantee anyone has is that he participate fully in the life of his own organization and not delegate and not allow his own responsibilities to be passed on to somebody else.

If you leave it to George, let George do it, you wake up some time and find that George hasn't done it the way you would have preferred to do it or the way you would have done it had you been there.

And it is my firm conviction that one of the most hazardous parts of our democratic process is the tendency of people to leave it to somebody else to take care of their own responsibility.

If a democracy is to work, if it is to be a democracy or continue to be a democracy, it is essential that each participant, each member be a participant. That is the best recommendation I can make.

Mr. MOULDER. That is very true. In our investigations the committee has found many instances where the Communist Party leaders have been able to infiltrate into, say, a local union in the eastern section of this country because the membership did not attend the elections and did not vote and participate actively in the meetings. If there were other means of voting than to be personally present, that might be avoided.

Mr. DENNETT. I favor referendum votes myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, the point you are making is: There is a very great responsibility on each individual in his own organization regardless of the organization.

Mr. DENNETT. I would add to that, sir, if I may, please, that it is necessary that members do more than attend meetings. I mean they must have some adequate conception of the purpose of their organization.

Just like in the conduct of the affairs of the Government of the United States, I don't think it is sufficient for persons to be elected as Congressmen and then just sit there. I think they have got to know what the Constitution of the United States provides, and I think they have to be the guardians to make certain that everybody abides by it, and that they abide by it themselves and insist that their own members abide by it.

I think that the question of a member just being a member of an organization and just being a card-carrying member is not sufficient. Likewise, it is not sufficient to have representatives of government just be present. Being present isn't enough. They have to understand what they are there for. And pursue their purpose of representing their constituents.

I say that as a comparison because the two things are similar. There is an identity.

Our greatest democratic practice occurs in the organizations which are not directly associated with government as such.

Mr. MOULDER. That applies, as you have said, to unions and organizations social or otherwise, as well as the general election of the United States where probably only 65 percent of the people go to the polls and vote.

Mr. TAVENNER. A very simple way of expressing what you have said is that people should be informed.

Mr. DENNETT. They must be informed.

And I am strictly opposed to secret negotiations, whether it occurs between employers and unions, whether it occurs between heads of organizations, or whether it occurs in international affairs. I think that the only safeguard that we have that the rights of the people will not be trespassed upon is when everything is out in the open.

I am willing to admit that until an agreement is arrived at, until a conclusion is reached, it may be necessary to conduct the negotiations or the conferences with a limited amount of access to public discussion. That may be so. I am not prepared to say that everything must be done in a goldfish bowl. But I am very insistent in my own conviction and in my own practices, at least for the past several years, that anything I do is going to be out in the open where the whole

world can take a look at it. If they don't like it they can say so. And if that is the way they feel about it, fine. I'll step aside and retire. But if they do approve it, let them go ahead.

Mr. MOULDER. When discussing the Washington Commonwealth Federation yesterday, did you give an estimate of 5,500 as being, in your opinion, the total Communist Party membership in the State of Washington or in this district?

Mr. DENNETT. I said at that time there were approximately 5,500 members at one time in 1 year. I think it was 1938.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you any knowledge or information, whether it be in the form of an opinion or from your experience, as to the total Communist Party membership in this area at the present time?

Mr. DENNETT. No. I have no adequate idea about that. I think that it must be very small. Someone asked me the other day what I thought it was, and I said, "Well, I think the ranks of the Communist Party have been decimated by their own foolish behavior and by the change in public attitude. I think that has resulted in them being reduced to a mere handful, a shell of its former self."

Mr. MOULDER. Then you would tell us now that you have no knowledge or information of any communistic or Communist Party activity in Seattle at this time?

Mr. DENNETT. No. We are coming to the point of my expulsion, which occurred 7, nearly 8 years ago. So my experience and knowledge would have to break at that point with respect to the Communist Party itself.

Mr. VELDE. I presume you are familiar generally with the testimony Barbara Hartle gave here?

Mr. DENNETT. I listened to it very carefully.

Mr. VELDE. She brought Communist Party activities in this area up to date as nearly as anyone possibly could in her situation.

Would you appraise her testimony as being true as to general matters concerning Communist activities here?

Mr. DENNETT. In all fairness to her and in all fairness to the persons that she mentioned, I would have to say that I think Barbara Hartle was her real self when she was here. She appeared to me to be exactly the same as the person I knew many years before. She was very deliberate and methodical. She always had been. And I think that she gave as accurate an account as she could possibly do. I marvel at the ability that she displayed in doing it, the names that she mentioned.

I have tried to explain to my personal friends—they have asked me about it; how could a person name so many people as she did? I can only say that Barbara was in a position where she had access to those records. It was part of her duty to handle records of the membership. Therefore, she would be required to know those things.

People have asked me, "Well, do you know the same people that she knew?" And I have had to answer, "I certainly knew most of those people."

But I am not in a position where I could say that, of my own knowledge, I knew those persons as members of the Communist Party.

I knew practically all of those persons in some capacity or another, but in very few instances is it possible for me to say, of my own knowledge, that I knew such and such a person to be a member of the Communist Party.

And that was a very important distinction for me to make.

But I must say that it is my considered judgment that Barbara Hartle gave very valid and very accurate information.

Mr. VELDE. I certainly thank you for that, Mr. Dennett. That was my impression, too. Not being in a position to know as much about it as either of you I did get the impression that she told a very valid story.

Mr. DENNETT. I am sure she was accurate.

Mr. VELDE. I appreciate your verification of her story as to the extent of the Communist Party in this area.

Another thing I would like to get cleared up before we go further, Mr. Counsel and Mr. Chairman, is a matter of your identification of Harry Lundeberg as having attended fraction meetings. I think you probably are as anxious to get that cleared up as we are. We know that Mr. Lundeberg has been a very faithful anti-Communist for a long time.

Would you like to make further comment on that?

Mr. DENNETT. I didn't expect that that would come up, and I was quite surprised at the furor it has created. I had no idea at the time that I mentioned this that it was of such importance or that such importance would be made of it.

I think perhaps it requires that I give you a little bit more detail of how I had such knowledge so that you may judge for yourselves as to the accuracy or validity of what I had to say.

Mr. VELDE. Actually, of course, back in those days about which you were testifying there was nothing seriously wrong in the minds of most American people with attending fraction meetings of the Communist Party. So I agree with you. I don't see any reason for all the furor. But I thought possibly you would like to clear it up.

Mr. DENNETT. I certainly would, sir. Thank you for asking me.

The first I heard of the furor, a friend of mine called me on the phone last night and asked me if I had read the morning paper which carried the story of Mr. Lundeberg's denial. I said I had not. So he read it to me, and he asked me what I had to say about it then. Some of my personal friends did. And I had to remind him, just as I just stated to you, that I had no idea it was going to have that much importance attached to it.

But let me give you the facts as it occurred.

You will recall in my testimony I mentioned going into the Inland-boatmen's Union of the Pacific, what was then the Ferry Boatmen's Union. It was in 1936—Well, it was in 1935, the end of 1935 when the first strike occurred against an arbitration award.

At that time the Maritime Federation of the Pacific had been already organized. Mr. Lundeberg was the president of it. Their headquarters were here in Seattle. He had an office here in a building close to the Pioneer Square. I believe it is properly called Pioneer Place. Mr. Lundeberg held an office there as the president of the federation, and his first and able assistant was Mr. Ernest Fox whom I have mentioned before.

When I was elected a delegate to represent the crew of the ship that I was working on, to attend our first strike meeting, on my way to that meeting I stopped at the office of the president of the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, Mr. Harry Lundeberg, and asked him

what he thought of the situation that I found myself in; namely, elected as a delegate, representing an organization which I knew practically nothing about. And I asked him further what advice he would give me.

Mr. Lundeberg was very gracious to me, and advised me that the "tule" sailors—by which he referred to our Sound freight-boat men because he didn't consider us to be genuine sailors at all because we didn't get outside into deep water; we were always here in the rivers or the harbors, and he called us "tule" sailors.

And he said, "The first thing you have got to do is get rid of your finky leaders."

And I asked him on what basis he made such a statement.

And he said, "You talk to Ernie. Ernie can tell you the whole story, and I will O. K. and vouch for it."

So I asked Ernest Fox a little bit more about it. And Ernie explained to me that the maritime leaders at that time had a great hatred for the leaders of the then ferry boatmen's union because those leaders of the ferry boatmen's union had not gone along with the general strike plans in San Francisco in 1934. And Mr. Lundeberg was one of the principal supporters of those strike plans at that time.

As a result of Mr. Lundeberg's attitude at that time, the Communist Party had the utmost confidence in his integrity and in his leadership. And Mr. Fox, Ernest Fox, informed me that Lundeberg had attended fraction meetings, taught fraction meetings where he had met with 1 or 2 party leaders to outline the policy and program to be followed.

Mr. VELDE. When you say "party leaders" are you referring to the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. That is right; I am referring to Communist Party leaders.

But Mr. Fox also warned me at that time that he had a few misgivings about where Mr. Lundeberg was going because Mr. Lundeberg had already begun to show evidence that he was beginning to have differences with the party and that he was resisting attending any more fraction meetings at a very early date.

So it is quite true that Mr. Lundeberg was incensed. He didn't like the Communist Party.

I simply mention in passing, at the outset, that he had been brought into a fraction meeting, and it was common knowledge.

Mr. MOULDER. In other words, he had been brought into contact with the Communist Party leaders as a result of the work he was performing but not in the capacity of being a Communist himself? Is that what you are saying?

Mr. DENNETT. That is true. Even the most ardent anti-Communist can be drawn into Communist activities.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you mean drawn into contact with Communists?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes.

My counsel cautions me to be certain that you understand I at no time accused Mr. Harry Lundeberg of being a Communist.

Mr. VELDE. I think that is a matter of record. In fact, you have said everything favorable to Mr. Lundeberg's record. But I suppose it might be presumed that if you and another Communist Party leader

had a conference with Mr. Lundeborg some time that that would be a meeting such as you mentioned in your testimony yesterday, or could be considered a fraction meeting; could it not?

Mr. DENNETT. No; that would not be regarded as a top fraction meeting. A top fraction meeting would be only a meeting where the leaders of an organization who were members of the Communist Party met either with themselves or with some official of the Communist Party. And in Mr. Lundeborg's case—

Mr. VELDE. Is that the type of meeting to which you referred when you said that you had general knowledge, or it was common knowledge that Mr. Lundeborg attended top fraction meetings?

Mr. DENNETT. True.

Mr. TAVENNER. My recollection of your testimony was that you made it clear Mr. Lundeborg was not a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. DENNETT. I thought so; I meant to, certainly.

Mr. TAVENNER. You meant to, and if there is any question about your testimony on that point I understand you now do make it clear that you did not intend, and that you did not characterize Mr. Lundeborg as a member of the Communist Party. Am I correct in that?

Mr. DENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. And your only information about his attendance at a so-called fraction meeting was the information given to you by his assistant, Mr. Fox?

Mr. DENNETT. And I might say, for verification, that the very line which Mr. Lundeborg had urged upon me to follow was exactly the line which the leaders of the Communist Party gave me at that time also; namely, attack your leaders, get rid of them.

Mr. TAVENNER. We were discussing the activity of the Communist Party within the Old-Age Pension Union. Will you tell the committee, please, whether you can at this time recall the names of other persons active in that organization who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. My own knowledge doesn't extend beyond the top leaders of that organization, which I have already mentioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. That brings us to the period you described yesterday when the Washington Commonwealth Federation was being dissolved. My recollection is you indicated that it was dissolved at the instance of the Communist Party. Am I correct in that?

Mr. DENNETT. It did that during the Second World War when I was in the military service. I only know of that from correspondence and what I read in the newspapers.

Mr. TAVENNER. You also told us that the component parts of the Washington Commonwealth Federation began to pull away from that organization.

Mr. DENNETT. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the reason for that?

Mr. DENNETT. The main reason was the conflicting international policies.

You will recall that in that historical period there were rapid changes taking place.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am trying to return to the point where we broke off testimony on that subject.

What became your activity in the field, in this general field upon the weakening of the federation as a result of the change in international problems you described yesterday?

Mr. DENNETT. With the rise of the CIO following the split in the labor movement I was elected to be the secretary of the Seattle CIO Council, and subsequently became the executive secretary of the Washington State CIO Council.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us dates, please?

Mr. DENNETT. In 1937 the American Federation of Labor started expelling from its ranks those unions which had advocated the industrial form of organization. I was in a union which did advocate the industrial form of organization, but we were not one of those that attracted primary interest. Therefore, they did not expel our union right away. They never did expel it in fact. However, since we were supporting the industrial form of organization, I advocated that our organization be among the first to swing to the CIO. That was the Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific.

Subsequently, a referendum vote was held and the membership voted overwhelmingly to withdraw from the American Federation of Labor and affiliate with the CIO.

Being one of the most regular representatives of the organization among outside affiliates, I was selected and elected by the members of these unions to represent what was first called the Seattle Unity Council, in 1937. In that year we had affiliated to that council both CIO and A. F. of L. organizations and unaffiliated organizations.

To make a long story short, I could say that my activities there were transferred to a larger field when I became the secretary of the State CIO council, which was founded in 1938. And history will confirm that the first convention of the CIO was also held that year in Atlantic City.

I was a delegate to that convention, and there I came in contact with the national leadership of the CIO unions, and with the national leaders in the CIO unions who were known to me as Communists.

Do you wish me to go into that now?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, briefly.

Mr. DENNETT. One of the first instructions that I received in that matter was from a man by the name of Roy Hudson who was the national—well, he objected to being called the labor expert in the central committee of the Communist Party. However, he usually had the duty of following the assignments of the respective Communist members.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment.

Mr. Chairman, you will probably recall that we had Roy Hudson as a witness in our California hearings in December of 1953, but he refused to give this committee any material information.

Mr. DENNETT. Well, he gave me some instructions when I went to a national convention, and his instruction to me was very brief. He said, "Any time you need to settle a question and you are in doubt, just see Lee Pressman."

Mr. TAVENNER. Lee Pressman?

Mr. DENNETT. Lee Pressman.

I did try to do that, but my experience with Lee Pressman was highly unsatisfactory, and I came back to one of the district bureau

meetings and reported the unsatisfactory nature of my relations with him, and the district organizer instructed me to destroy the report which I had brought back.

I had brought back a somewhat detailed report of my unsatisfactory experiences with him, and the bureau listened with considerable astonishment at my impressions of how unsatisfactory this situation was. That was from the first convention. And after that, after they had instructed me to destroy the records, they also instructed me to not talk about it with anyone because they feared it might undermine the prestige of such an important person as Mr. Lee Pressman.

Mr. VELDE. During what period of time did you know Mr. Pressman?

Mr. DENNETT. That was in 1938.

Mr. VELDE. At that time he was in the CIO. He had left the Government, as I understand it.

Mr. DENNETT. He was the general counsel of the CIO, and was John L. Lewis' righthand man.

Mr. VELDE. I do not recall the date of Mr. Pressman's testimony. Was it in 1949?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; in 1949 or early 1950 we had him as a witness before our committee and interrogated him on his connection with the CIO at that particular time.

Mr. VELDE. Did you know Lee Pressman as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. I didn't know that personally. I was just under the instruction—I asked Roy Hudson who I should see in the event I got crossed up and didn't know what policy to pursue or anything, and he said, "See Lee Pressman. Do what he says."

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which we should follow through. But, not knowing the character of the experience this witness had with Mr. Pressman, I believe it is a matter we should investigate fully before attempting to further examine the witness on the subject.

Mr. MOULDER. Very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have documentary evidence of any character on that incident?

Mr. DENNETT. I can't be sure whether I have or not. I don't recall all the things that I have in my files.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed, please.

Mr. DENNETT. Well, I came in contact with many other leaders in the national CIO. I used to have the habit of attending the national CIO executive board meetings whenever the convention was over. There had been an election of new officials at the close of the convention, and I was usually there in company with the president of the Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific, who became a member of the executive board. And he usually asked me to come along with him.

And it has always been my habit to take rather copious notes. As a matter of fact, most people screamed to high heaven because the notes I take are a little bit too full and too elaborate. I do that for my own benefit because I try not to rely solely on memory. I have found it very profitable in my own experience to have my full memoranda at hand when I am called upon to testify.

And in this testimony here I am testifying almost completely from memory, but I assure you that I have plenty of memoranda and data

which cannot only substantiate what I have been testifying, but enrich it very, very much.

Mr. TAVENNER. What further information can you give us as to the Communist Party membership of individuals in this new field in which you were engaged?

Mr. DENNETT. Well, of course, one of our principal centers of interest was the International Woodworkers of America. And there, of course, it became my responsibility to become well acquainted with the top leadership in the International Woodworkers of America. And I think that many people have made the accusation but probably few people know of their own knowledge such as I do, that practically all of the top leaders were, with a few exceptions, members of the Communist Party. And that began with Mr. Harold J. Pritchett.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. DENNETT. P-r-i-t-c-h-e-t-t.

Mr. Harold Pritchett was a very able and outstanding man from the lumber industry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was was his official title?

Mr. DENNETT. He was the president.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the period or the date?

Mr. DENNETT. 1938.

He was a Canadian and was barred from reentry into the United States shortly afterward, and has been unable—he was at that time unable to continue his functions as president, and had to give up the office of president.

We were quite disappointed that that occurred. We tried every way we knew to insure that he could continue to serve in that capacity. However, we had to be satisfied with allowing another member who was a vice president to take his position. This was Mr. O. M. Orton, O-r-t-o-n, better known to us as Mickey Orton. He was the vice president who took over when Mr. Pritchett had to give up the office.

The office staff—I mean the girls who worked in the office were virtually cleared by the Communist Party before they secured their employment in the office. The girl who was in charge at that office—the name I knew her by—

Mr. TAVENNER. You said virtually cleared?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that mean that the worker you have in mind must have been a member of the Communist Party? In other words, we do not want you to give us the name of a person unless you have evidence of actual Communist Party membership.

Mr. DENNETT. I will not name anyone unless that person was a member of the Communist Party, according to my knowledge. Well, the girl who was looked upon as the office manager—I don't recall the exact title she had—but her name was Gladys Field, F-i-e-l-d. And all the stenographers and bookkeepers who were employed by the organization had to meet her approval before they could be employed in that office. And her approval was based upon whether or not the person would be friendly or hostile to the Communist Party, as well as being, of course, efficient and able to do the job. She was an exceedingly efficient girl herself, and did a splendid job as an office manager. She would be a credit to any office so far as her office work is concerned, and she was a credit to that organization. She had as

one of her able assistants a girl by the name of Helen Sobeleski. I am not sure that I can spell that. It is a Polish name.

Well along in that period Mr. Karley Larsen came into prominence in the Woodworkers.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what union does this testimony relate concerning officials and employees?

Mr. DENNETT. The International Woodworkers of America.

Another person I knew was Nat Honig, H-o-n-i-g.

Nat Honig was brought into the district by Morris Rappaport to become an agitprop director. I knew Mr. Honig quite well, and I sympathized with the task that he had. He didn't last very long in that either. He soon found himself as editor of the Woodworkers' paper, the International Woodworkers of America's paper. And I had occasion to attempt to get him to carry out the party line, and I was amazed to find a man who was officially holding a position of district agitprop director while he was editor of that paper, and yet, when the May Day issue of that paper came out there wasn't one single mention of the fact that May Day was the historical day to be commemorated for the 8-hour day in America and was heralded throughout the world as laborers' day.

Mr. Honig explained it away, that he didn't think it was appropriate to do it.

I went to Mr. Rappaport complaining, "What kind of a district agitprop is this man anyway?"

And Rappaport had quite a session with Honig, and shortly after that Mr. Honig began to have some disaffection from the party and the party policy, and I believe he appeared before the Canwell committee shortly afterward and gave voluminous testimony about the Communist Party. I have not read his testimony. I do not know how valid it is. I couldn't confirm or deny what he said. I don't know.

Mr. VELDE. What was the approximate time?

Mr. DENNETT. That was in that period 1939, I believe; 1939 or 1940 when that happened.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall any other individuals connected with the International Woodworkers of America who were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. I have a little difficulty thinking of any others at the moment in that particular union.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee had before it at Albany, N. Y., in July 1953, a Canadian by the name of Patrick Walsh who was connected with that organization in the western part of Canada during one period of time and who later became very prominent in the Canadian seamen's union strike in 1949.

Did you become acquainted with Patrick Walsh?

Mr. DENNETT. No; I never knew him.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will stand recessed for 5 minutes. (Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dennett, you were giving us the names of persons known to you to be members of the Communist Party within the field of labor at the time that you were a member of the CIO council.

Mr. DENNETT. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you proceed, please?

Mr. DENNETT. Well, of course, I think I mentioned Mr. Hugh DeLacy before. He was from the teachers union. And, of course, there was one of his associates, a man by the name of Harold Eby. They were the only ones that I knew directly in the Communist Party, in the teachers union, from the university.

There was another person by the name of Victor Hicks who was quite well known to me who was in the other teachers union. There were two teachers' unions, locals here. One applied to the public schools, and one applied to the university. Victor Hicks was in the one that applied to the public schools, although I don't believe he was a public-school teacher himself. But he had taught in one of those Government assistance programs. I forget which one it was. There was some kind of an educational program that was conducted in the depression days that Mr. Hicks was associated with, and he was the principal one. In fact, he was responsible for nominating me to the position of secretary of the council in the first CIO council in Seattle.

Of course, I knew Mr. Jess Fletcher in the Building Service Employees International Union, which was an A. F. of L. union, not one of the CIO unions.

In the Longshoremen's Union¹ I knew Mr. Burt Nelson, B-u-r-t N-e-l-s-o-n.

I knew these people as members of the Communist Party, and they were the leaders with whom I dealt most frequently in dealing with union affairs and with party affairs.

Mr. MOULDER. When naming a person, if possible, identify him in some way so he will not be confused with any person who may have a similar name.

Mr. DENNETT. Burt was a longshoreman. He worked as a longshoreman on the Seattle waterfront.

George Bailey was a longshoreman known to me first in Raymond, Wash. Later I knew him on the Seattle waterfront.

Mr. TAVENNER. How does he spell his name?

Mr. DENNETT. I believe it was B-a-i-l-e-y.

In the early days of the organization of the warehousemen's local of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union the two principal officers of the organization were very well known to me as members of the Communist Party. However, they frequently did not comply with the party policy, and we had frequent difficulty trying to get them to comply with it. And I believe that they have both since left the Communist Party. I make that by way of statement to be certain that there is no misapprehension as to my knowledge about them. One was Mr. John Stevens, better known as Johnny. Another one was Adrian Lawrence, A-d-r-i-a-n L-a-w-r-e-n-c-e.

In the Marine Firemen's Union,² which was not in the CIO, but it was a waterfront union with which I was closely associated, was Mr. Walter Stack, S-t-a-c-k, who has previously been mentioned, and a person by the name of George Flood. Now I hope no one will mistake him for another individual who is very prominent as a lawyer. I am not speaking of the lawyer. It is not the lawyer at all, because he is

¹ This is a reference to the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

² This is a reference to Marine Firemen, Oilers, Watertenders and Wipers Association Pacific Coast.

a well known leader of the Republican Party, and I am sure that no one will confuse him.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DENNETT. My counsel advises me that that George Flood is deceased. I was unaware of it.

The George Flood of whom I am speaking was a sort of hunchback fellow who was a marine fireman.

At an earlier period I knew a group of people in the Boeing union, the machinists union, who were known to me as members of the Communist Party. That came about when one of the organizers of the United Automobile Workers of America came into Seattle wanting to swing the affiliation from the machinists union to the United Automobile Workers. That national leader was a man by the name of Wyndham Mortimer, W-y-n-d-h-a-m M-o-r-t-i-m-e-r. He was an organizer. At that time he was stationed in California. He was quite anxious to bring about the change in affiliation of the Boeing workers because he knew that the employment at that plant would increase, and had hoped that, by winning that group of workers, they would add considerable prestige and strength to the United Automobile Workers aircraft division. He had been active in a big plant. I think it was the Lockheed plant in California at that time.

When he came here he conferred with two persons known to me very well, a man by the name of Hugo Lundquist, L-u-n-d-q-u-i-s-t, and Barney Bader, B-a-d-e-r. They were at that time the top leaders of the aeronautical workers union, and they became known to me through Mr. Mortimer as members of the Communist Party. And they completely disregarded my counsel which was that they were embarked on a foolhardy effort and that we disagreed with any attempt at jurisdictional rating. Our policy here was strictly opposed to it.

However, Mortimer was operating under authority of the top apparatus of the party, namely, the central committee in New York City. And he completely disregarded any advice or counsel which was offered by the district bureau or the district leaders of the Communist Party in this area.

It was our policy to not disturb the existing unions to change affiliation. To us that was ridiculous and had no point of value. Our concern was to not have our members upset or disturbed in those organizations.

Mr. TAVENNER. It may be of importance for us to know the year in which this incident occurred.

Mr. DENNETT. I would have to consult my records, but I can assure you I have records on that. I have extensive correspondence with Mr. Mortimer on that subject.

Mr. TAVENNER. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. VELDE. Is the Walter Stack, to whom you referred, the same Walter Stack who was convicted of violation of the Smith Act?

Mr. DENNETT. I don't know what his violation is, but I am sure he is the man who was very prominent in the marine firemen's union over a great many years. He came from here when I knew him.

Mr. VELDE. I feel certain that it is one and the same person. I noted in the newspaper the other day that his appeal was turned down by the United States circuit court of appeals.

Mr. DENNETT. In the national conventions of the CIO, after my first experience, which was highly unsatisfactory, with Mr. Lee Press-

man, I complained so bitterly when I came back to the district that the next convention I went to I was instructed before I left that I should work through Reid Robinson, who was president of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers of America at that time. Mr. Robinson proved to be a very cooperative man and readily discussed party affairs with me. That was in 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you were given instructions to work through Robinson. Was that an instruction from your union as such, or was it an instruction from the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. That was from the Communist Party.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DENNETT. My counsel thinks that I have not sufficiently identified Mr. Lee Pressman. He was at the time I knew him general counsel of the CIO.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you proceed, please.

Mr. DENNETT. My relations with Mr. Reid Robinson were quite satisfactory except that at a little bit later date, when I was under sharp attack because of the growing split between left and right wings in the State CIO in this State, I tried to get Mr. Reid Robinson to come to this State to try to pacify the situation, and he was fearful of doing so for fear he would get into more complications than he could solve. So he deserted me when I needed help.

Earlier, of course, I knew Ferdinand Smith from the National Maritime Union of America. I believe he has been deported from the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is correct.

Mr. DENNETT. It is the same person. I had known him over a period of several years.

I also came to know the president of the officeworkers union at that time. That was the United Office and Professional Workers of America, Mr. Lewis Merrill. He was known to me by that name then. I have heard from friends since then that that was an assumed name or something. At any rate, he is doing business in New York City under an entirely different name as of this date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know that name?

Mr. DENNETT. I do not know that name. I know a person who does, who lives in the city of Seattle, and who knows him. But I do not know him myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell his name, the name that he went by here?

Mr. DENNETT. L-e-w-i-s M-e-r-r-i-l-l.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you proceed, please?

Mr. DENNETT. At a much earlier period—I am going back to try to pick up the loose threads that we left out when we should have mentioned them, but I was unable to connect all my thoughts consecutively at that time. In the organization of the Marine Workers Industrial Union Mr. Harry Jackson, whom I mentioned to you, was the chief leader of that effort here. But he had 2 or 3 very able assistants, one by the name of James Archer, A-r-c-h-e-r. Archer is the man to whom I delivered about \$35 which was taken up as a collection when I was in the CCC camp when I came to Seattle on a visit from the camp. It was a collection from the men in the camp to assist the maritime strikers at that time, and Mr. Archer is the man to whom

I delivered that money in the headquarters of the Marine Workers Industrial Union.

Another person who was very active in that work was a person by the name of Tommy Ray, R-a-y. Later I met Tommy Ray after I was expelled from the Communist Party. Tommy Ray at that time was a port agent for the National Maritime Union. And I tried to discuss with him the question of the disciplinary practices of the Communist Party, and Ray was so incensed about his own experience that he wouldn't discuss it with me except to say, "Don't talk to me about those so-and-sos. I don't want to have anything further to do with them." And that is about all I was able to obtain from him. But it was the same person, and I believe he is still an active person in the National Maritime Union. But he is bitterly anti-Communist today.

There was another person by the name of Tom Burns. I don't know how we can make a distinction for him, because there are so many persons by that name except to say that he was a seaman. I learned later from Tommy Ray that Tom Burns became a licensed man, left the Communist Party long before, and has had nothing to do with it; that is, in recent years. Although he was a very able man way back in the period of 1932, 1933, and 1934 when he was very active in the organization of the Marine Workers Industrial Union, and had a great part in organizing the sailors on the waterfront in Seattle at that time.

I knew Tommy Burns' wife quite well, a person by the name of—I knew her originally as Helmi Hutonen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Spell it, please.

Mr. DENNETT. I cannot be certain of the spelling of it, but, as near as I recall, it was H-u-t-e-n-e-n. There was double spelling in there that I am not certain of. Helmi was H-e-l-m-i.

There was a leader of the radio operators, marine radio operators, by the name of Thomas J. Van Erman. I observed in Mrs. Hartle's testimony that she referred to a Mr. Van Orman. I am not referring to any Van Orman. I don't know any Van Orman. The man I know was Van Erman, V-a-n E-r-m-a-n. And Mr. Van Erman that I knew worked on the Seattle waterfront as a radio operator and was, I believe he was the port agent of that organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let the record show in describing these persons you knew and met, that you knew them as members of the Communist Party.

Mr. DENNETT. That is correct.

I frequently made myself quite obnoxious to Mr. Van Erman because I was always asking him to be a little more militant and a little more positive in his work. And he was quite insistent that I was wrong, and we had a continuing friction over that point. However, we were great personal friends.

The Cannery Workers Union was a local affiliate of the United Cannery, Agricultural, and Packinghouse Workers of America. In the national leadership I knew a Mr. Donald Henderson, who was the president of that organization. I knew him very well, associated with him frequently at the convention, transacted a great deal of business with him concerning the cannery workers out here because we were having a great deal of difficulty over language problems.

The cannery workers in that union were those who were sent to Alaska regularly each year to work in the salmon industry.

And in the local area I knew Mr. Conrad Espe. Mr. Con Espe was the local representative of that international union.

There was a member of that union who was the most promising Communist that we had, by the name of I. Hosue, H-o-s-u-e. He was a very able man. I have heard since from people who are somewhat acquainted with the facts that Mr. Hosue went into the military service, became an officer during the course of the war, and turned bitterly anti-Communist. And I understand that he gave testimony against certain other members of the organization in certain deportation hearings. I can only give you that much by way of identification. But that is the man I am speaking of.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, if the witness recalls any other names, that he give them to us at a later period, as we desire to proceed now with other witnesses.

Mr. MOULDER. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I want to recall this witness a little later in the day on other matters.

Mr. MOULDER. At what time do you want Mr. Dennett back?

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe that he should be back after lunch. I would say at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MOULDER. Two o'clock.

Thank you, Mr. Dennett. At 2 o'clock you will be recalled.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Paul Delaney, please.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. DELANEY. I do.

TESTIMONY OF PAUL WILLIAM DELANEY, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, RICHARD L. GEMSON

Mr. WHEELER. Will the witness state his full name, please.

Mr. DELANEY. Paul William Delaney.

Mr. WHEELER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. DELANEY. D-e-l-a-n-e-y.

Mr. WHEELER. When and where were you born, Mr. Delaney?

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask, Mr. Delaney, are you represented by counsel?

Mr. DELANEY. Yes; I am.

Mr. MOULDER. Will counsel identify himself?

Mr. GEMSON. R. L. Gemson. I am a practicing attorney here in Seattle.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Wheeler.

Mr. WHEELER. When and where were you born, Mr. Delaney?

Mr. DELANEY. I was born in 1903 in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. WHEELER. How long have you lived in Washington?

Mr. DELANEY. 51 years.

Mr. WHEELER. Advise the committee of your educational background, please.

Mr. DELANEY. I went to school in this State; through grammar school and high school; I attended the University of Washington 2 years. I didn't graduate.

Mr. WHEELER. What 2 years was that?

Mr. DELANEY. I think in the years 1923 and 1927.

Mr. WHEELER. What is your present occupation?

Mr. DELANEY. I am an architect.

Mr. WHEELER. How long have you been so engaged?

Mr. DELANEY. Well, I grew up in the construction business. I have been a licensed architect since 1950 or 1951. I can't state accurately.

Mr. WHEELER. How were you employed prior to that?

Mr. DELANEY. I came to Seattle in 1941. I worked at Sims Drake Puget Sound. It was a contracting firm here. I worked with a construction company after that who built defense housing. After that, I worked, the last year of the war—in my recollection—at Boeing Aircraft Co.

Mr. WHEELER. When did your employment terminate with Boeing Aircraft?

Mr. DELANEY. When the war was over.

Mr. WHEELER. In 1945?

Mr. DELANEY. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. Have you completed your employment background?

Mr. DELANEY. Do you want me to bring it up to date?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. DELANEY. As soon as the war was over I went to work as an architectural draftsman. I went then with an architect by the name of Collins. I think he left in 1950 or 1951, and I have been alone since then.

Mr. WHEELER. Did you ever know Barbara Hartle?

Mr. DELANEY. May I confer with my attorney?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, sir?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DELANEY. On the advice of my counsel, I must invoke the fifth amendment, on the grounds that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. MOULDER. As previously explained by the committee because your counsel advises you to take or invoke the fifth amendment that does not compel you to do so. If you prefer, you may state that you decline to answer the question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DELANEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. WHEELER. Mrs. Hartle has advised the committee that you were a functionary of the Queen Anne section of the Communist Party during the years 1943-45. Is she correct in that statement?

Mr. DELANEY. May I again confer?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DELANEY. For reasons previously given, I decline to answer this question.

Mr. WHEELER. Our investigation has also developed information that you were chairman of the Hilltop Club of the Communist Party in the year 1948. Is that correct?

Mr. VELDE. What was the name of the club?

Mr. WHEELER. Hilltop, H-i-l-l-t-o-p.

Mr. DELANEY. Pardon me one moment.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DELANEY. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. WHEELER. Our investigation has also developed that in the year 1943 you were issued Communist Party book No. 28704. I doubt, if you recall the number of the book, but were you issued a Communist Party book in the year 1943 by the Communist Party?

Mr. DELANEY. I decline to answer for the reasons previously given.

Mr. WHEELER. In the year 1945 were you issued Communist Party book No. 42131.

Mr. DELANEY. I also decline to answer that for the reasons previously given.

Mr. WHEELER. In the year 1947 were you issued Communist Party book No. 55934 by the Communist Party?

Mr. DELANEY. I decline to answer for the same reasons previously given.

Mr. WHEELER. Are you a member of the Communist Party today, Mr. Delaney?

Mr. DELANEY. I must—I decline to answer that for the reasons previously given.

Mr. WHEELER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DELANEY. I must—I mean I decline to answer that.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DELANEY. For the reasons previously stated.

Mr. VELDE. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Delaney, we have heard many arguments against persons coming before congressional investigative committees and making accusations or statements concerning other people, and that those people do not have the opportunity to clear themselves or make explanation of the charges made against them, such as Mrs. Hartle has testified concerning you and your activities.

This committee has very carefully in each instance given the person so mentioned an opportunity to come before the committee to deny, affirm, or explain the charges made. And that opportunity is being presented to you today by a subpoena issued upon you for your appearance here.

In reply to the questions propounded to you, I understand you decline to answer because of the protection afforded you under the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Is that right?

Mr. DELANEY. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you wish to make any explanation, or to deny or affirm any of these statements or charges which were made by Mrs. Hartle concerning your communistic activities?

Mr. DELANEY. May I confer with my counsel?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DELANEY. My counsel instructs me to state that I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment—on the ground that it might tend to incriminate me.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. MOULDER. Counsel, proceed with the next witness.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Jacob Bitterman.

Mr. MOULDER. Will you hold up your right hand and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this congressional committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BITTERMAN. Yes, sir.

**TESTIMONY OF JACOB BITTERMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS
COUNSEL, KENNETH A. MacDONALD**

Mr. WHEELER. Will the witness state his full name, please?

Mr. BITTERMAN. Jacob Bitterman.

Mr. VELDE. How do you spell the last name?

Mr. BITTERMAN. B-i-t-t-e-r-m-a-n.

Mr. WHEELER. Will counsel identify himself for the record?

Mr. MacDONALD. Kenneth A. MacDonald, attorney at law, in Seattle.

Mr. WHEELER. When and where were you born, Mr. Bitterman?

Mr. BITTERMAN. I was born in Russia in 1904.

Mr. WHEELER. When did you enter the United States?

Mr. BITTERMAN. To the best of my knowledge, in 1906.

Mr. WHEELER. How did you acquire American citizenship?

Mr. BITTERMAN. Through my father's papers.

Mr. WHEELER. When you became 21 years of age?

Mr. BITTERMAN. I was 12 when he became a citizen.

Mr. WHEELER. How long have you lived in Seattle or in the vicinity of Seattle?

Mr. BITTERMAN. I came to Seattle in 1923.

Mr. WHEELER. Have you lived here continuously since that time?

Mr. BITTERMAN. With the exception of 2 years, 1928 and 1929. That is, in the fall of 1928 to the fall of 1930 I lived in Aberdeen, Wash.

Mr. WHEELER. What is your educational background?

Mr. BITTERMAN. Well, I went to the third grade in country school.

Mr. WHEELER. What has your employment record been for the last 10 years?

Mr. BITTERMAN. Machinist.

Mr. WHEELER. In Seattle?

Mr. BITTERMAN. Yes. I have been a machinist ever since I have been in Seattle.

Mr. WHEELER. Are you a member of the International Association of Machinists?

Mr. BITTERMAN. Yes. I am a member of local 79.

Mr. WHEELER. Have you held any offices in local 79?

Mr. BITTERMAN. No, I haven't.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WHEELER. During the time you lived in Seattle did you ever meet with, know, or have any conversations with Barbara Hartle?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. BITTERMAN. I will invoke the fifth amendment because it might incriminate me.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you decline to answer that question?

Mr. BITTERMAN. I decline to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you decline on the grounds and on the reasons of the protection afforded to you by the provisions of the fifth amendment?

Mr. BITTERMAN. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to refer to a document entitled "Investigation of Communist Activities in the Pacific Northwest, Part 3," page 6173. It is the testimony of Barbara Hartle in June 1954. She is identifying members of the Communist Party, and I quote the following:

Jack Bitterman, then husband of Ruth Bitterman, was a member of this section in the machinists' branch, and was for a time chairman of that branch.

Do you wish to make any comment on that testimony?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. BITTERMAN. I invoke the fifth amendment, on the same grounds previously stated.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Wheeler is not asking you to confirm or deny it, but asked merely if you wanted to make some comment on it. Why do you take the fifth amendment on that question?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. BITTERMAN. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. WHEELER. Were you chairman of the machinists' branch of the Communist Party?

Mr. BITTERMAN. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds previously stated.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I see no reason for asking further questions. The witness is invoking the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. I have no questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BITTERMAN. No.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. BITTERMAN. I will again invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. You say you are not now a member of the Communist Party. Were you a member of the Communist Party a year ago?

Mr. BITTERMAN. I will again invoke the fifth amendment for fear it might incriminate me.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you a member of the Communist Party a month ago?

Mr. BITTERMAN. I will again invoke the fifth amendment on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. MOULDER. Would you say a week ago?

Mr. BITTERMAN. I will again invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. How about yesterday?

Mr. BITTERMAN. The same answer.

Mr. MOULDER. But you are not a member today?

Mr. BITTERMAN. I am not a member today.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. VELDE. I would like to go a little further. Were you a member of the Communist Party an hour ago?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. BITTERMAN. No, I was not.

Mr. VELDE. Were you a member of the Communist Party 5 hours ago?

Mr. BITTERMAN. No.

Mr. VELDE. When did you leave the Communist Party?

Mr. BITTERMAN. As to that I invoke the fifth amendment.

Mr. VELDE. Were you a member of the Communist Party at midnight last night?

Mr. BITTERMAN. No, I was not.

Mr. VELDE. How about 11 o'clock last night?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. BITTERMAN. I will invoke the fifth amendment to that question.

Mr. VELDE. I think that is close enough, is it not, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. MOULDER. Counsel, call the next witness.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. John Stenhouse.

Mr. MOULDER. Will you raise your right hand and be sworn?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this congressional subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I do.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN STENHOUSE, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, JACK R. CLUCK

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name?

Mr. STENHOUSE. John Stenhouse.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by counsel.

Will counsel identify himself?

Mr. CLUCK. Jack R. Cluck, C-l-u-c-k, 535 Central Building, Seattle.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Stenhouse?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I was born in Chungking, China, on January 22, 1908.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your last name, please.

Mr. STENHOUSE. S-t-e-n-h-o-u-s-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now an American citizen?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you naturalized?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I was naturalized in Los Angeles on April 23, 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you arrive in the United States?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I am not quite certain, but it was either December of 1940 or January of 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been in the United States continuously since that time?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No. In June 1948 I went out to China, and returned to the United States either September or October of the same year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been.

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I went to a public school in England, and after completing my education in England I went back to China.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you go back to China?

Mr. STENHOUSE. In 1928.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live in China from 1928 until you came to the United States?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I was in my father's business in China. The name of the firm was MacKenzie & Co., and they had several branches in China. I spent some time in Shanghai. I then went to—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you fix the dates, please.

Mr. STENHOUSE. It is pretty hard. But approximately 9 months in Shanghai. That would be in 1928.

I really don't remember the month that I got to Shanghai, but I was there approximately 9 months.

Then I went to Tientsin, and I was there until the beginning of 1931, I think it was.

Mr. VELDE. What kind of a company was MacKenzie & Co.?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, it was a British trading firm. We had—

Mr. VELDE. Import-export?

Mr. STENHOUSE. And warehouses and shipping and that sort of activity. Then I went to Hankow. I was there until about 1934. I remember the date because we went home on leave at that time, and I got married that year. And then after leave I went back to Tientsin, and I was there until 1939 when we went home on leave again.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean to your home in England?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes. Then I went back to China in the fall of 1939, just after war was declared, and I was in Tientsin until the end of—well, the end of 1940. During 1940 I was sent up on a mission by my company to Chungking and to Hong Kong. That lasted about 3 or 4 months, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. After your arrival in this country how did you become employed and where?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, before I left China I had made arrangements with a firm in Peiping to import and sell Chinese antiques. And he gave me the name of a man in Los Angeles with whom he had done business, and suggested that I call on him because he was in somewhat similar business. And when I got to Los Angeles I called on this gentleman and made arrangements to work out of his establishment.

Later on—I can't remember the date—I went into partnership with him under the style of Alkow & Stenhouse, and we conducted an importing business of Chinese antiques and sort of handicraft items, and had a retail outlet on Wilshire Boulevard.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you so engaged in business in Los Angeles?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Until Pearl Harbor. And I decided then that—

Mr. TAVENNER. From what date until Pearl Harbor?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, as soon as I got to Los Angeles, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. That date was what?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't remember the exact date, but it was sometime in January of 1941.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is sufficient.

Will you proceed, please. You continued in that business until Pearl Harbor. How were you employed after Pearl Harbor?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor the war was on. And, for one thing, I wanted to participate in the war. So I took a drafting course and then got a job with Shell Chemical in Dominguez, I think it was until the end of—I was there for 3 or 4 months, I think it was. I don't remember the exact date now.

Mr. VELDE. What was the name of the company?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Shell Chemical.

Mr. VELDE. Is that also known as Shell Development Co.?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't know. It may be a subsidiary. It was connected with the Shell Oil Co.

Then I got a job with Fruehauf Trailer Co., which was nearer home. And I was there until, I think, about June of 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you proceed a little more rapidly? What was your next employment?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Then I went to Bendix Aviation in North Hollywood. The reason for the change was, or one of the reasons for the change was, it was much nearer home, and gasoline was a problem. Time and transportation time were problems. And I was at Bendix until about March 1945, when I had a hernia operation and was told to get out of that sort of work.

At about that time there were notices in the papers asking for people with some background in the Far East to assist in finishing off the war against Japan. So I applied for a number of jobs. One was with the Office of War Information, and another was with the Office of Strategic Services. I also applied for work with 2 or 3 American companies who were planning or had had affiliations in the Far East.

And then I got an appointment with the United States Department of Commerce as an economic analyst in the China Section of the Far Eastern Division.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the first position you held under the United States Government?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And when did you enter the employ of the United States Government?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I think it was June 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did your duties require you to go to Washington?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in Washington?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I remained with the Government until November 1947, and—

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that with the Commerce Department until 1947?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Were you an economic analyst in the Far Eastern Division during your entire employment by the Government?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No. About a year after I was there I was promoted to Chief of the China Section and, some time in there, as Acting Assistant Chief of the Division. And a little later, just before I left the Department, I was temporary Acting Chief of the Division while the Division Chief was away.

In 1947, November 1947, my employment there terminated, and again I was looking for a suitable occupation. And I applied many, many places. I applied with many American firms who were in business in the Far East or had business connections in the Far East. And I also applied for an appointment that I heard about with the United Nations.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive the appointment with the United Nations?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. When?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I think it was about June of 1948. There was a period when I was living in Washington that I was not employed.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your employment by the United Nations?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I had a 3-month special appointment to go out to Shanghai to work on the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, which was a separate section of the United Nations. And the work was related to the rehabilitation of trade, with special reference to the development of interregional trade in the light of the changed situation after the war.

I wrote a report which was included in a document published by the United Nations.

At the end of the 3-month period I was appointed administrative assistant to the—I don't know what his actual title was, but it was something like director of food and agriculture mission in China; a 3-month appointment again, and I worked in that capacity for about 3 months; I think until the end of September, when I was found to have some possibilities of tuberculosis. So I wanted to go back to the United States and get a thorough investigation of that, and I got a letter from the director of the mission there to the home office suggesting that I be given a permanent contract—not a permanent contract but a more long-range contract to go out under circumstances that would allow me to take my family out. However, on the way back from China I stopped here in Seattle and met some businessmen for whom I had done some work in my official capacity in the Department. They were pleased with the work I had done and they suggested that I join their firm in Seattle.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the approximate date of your return to the United States when you first became a resident of this community?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, my return to the United States was about September or October of 1948. I went back to Washington—

Mr. TAVENNER. I understand that. But you told us about your return to the United States and stopping here in Seattle.

Mr. STENHOUSE. You asked me when I first came here, and became a resident. There was a gap of a couple of months because I went back to Washington to pick up my family, and we actually came here to Seattle as residents in January of 1949.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you resided in Seattle since that date?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your present occupation?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I am an insurance agent.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you read any of the testimony before this committee of General Willoughby who was G-2 on General MacArthur's staff, which related to the development of communism in China?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. General Willoughby documented considerable evidence before this committee regarding the activities of certain American citizens in China. My desire now is merely to ask you whether or not you observed any Communist Party activities on the part of American nationals in China?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. And I refer particularly to the period 1928 and 1929 when you were in Shanghai.

Mr. STENHOUSE. I didn't know anything about it. I was a businessman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you at any time been affiliated with the Communist Party, and, if so, in what country or countries?

Mr. STENHOUSE. During the war some 10 years ago I was a member of the Communist Party in this country.

Mr. TAVENNER. In this country?

Mr. STENHOUSE. And that is the only affiliation that I have had.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not asking you now about your own affiliation, or indicating that I believe you were affiliated with the Communist Party in China, but we are anxious to have any information you have regarding Communist Party activities in China.

Mr. STENHOUSE. I haven't any information, Mr. Tavenner. When I left China in 1940 I only had a very vague idea about what was going on there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me put the question to you this way because it is a very broad subject.

General Willoughby testified before this committee that the form of organization of mass organizations in China from 1929 on was virtually identical with what we have found in this country since the early and middle thirties, that is, in working through mass organizations or front organizations, as we frequently call them in this country.

Did you observe any activity of that kind?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No, and I wouldn't have done it because I was living in the international concessions in watertight compartments where we associated, except in business, with Europeans and Americans. I am somewhat—what was going on in the interior of China and in Chinese politics I was somewhat abysmally ignorant of in those days.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has been demonstrated that Americans, people from this country took an active part in some of that organizational work in China.

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I never did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the fact that you were in an international section mean that you could not have had any knowledge of it?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I didn't have any knowledge of it. I was involved in business until the Japanese threatened my business. I wasn't concerned with politics.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not indicating I have any information that you were involved in it. I am merely asking what knowledge you had of it?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I really have no knowledge.

Mr. VELDE. I think we ought to make this clear: Are you referring to the period of time you were in China prior to 1940, and not about your trip the second time?

Mr. STENHOUSE. That is correct.

Mr. VELDE. Have you been back more than once since 1940 to China?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No. Only once.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you say you became a member of the Communist Party while you were in Los Angeles?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the approximate date of your becoming a member?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, to the best of my recollection, it was in the latter part of 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you living at that time?

Mr. STENHOUSE. In Horseshoe Canyon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you assigned to any particular group of the Communist Party when you first became a member?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't think it was a matter of assignment, to my knowledge. I was asked if I would like to attend some discussion group meetings and, to the best of my recollection, there were not more than 4 or 5 of them in Los Angeles.

Mr. TAVENNER. Four or 5 what?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Of these discussion group meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean that you attended 4 or 5 of these discussion group meetings?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether or not you were transferred from one such group to another?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I am pretty certain I wasn't. I am not aware of it. Somebody may have transferred me. But, as far as I know, I attended a group of discussion meetings somewhere, not too far from where we lived in North Hollywood. I don't remember now whether it was in more than one home. It may have been in 1 or 2.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many persons attended those meetings?

Mr. STENHOUSE. About 4 or 5.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were they always the same persons or did the group vary as to its composition?

Mr. STENHOUSE. It may have varied. I don't remember for sure.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of the business conducted at those meetings?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, we discussed Communist and other literature and articles. We discussed the affairs that were concerning all of us at that time, of the war and the winning of the war—and it was just talk.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether or not Communist Party literature was made available for your purchase at the meetings?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes, it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. And for your use?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes, it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take part in the study group, in the study of the Communist Party literature yourself?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Oh, I suppose I read what we were asked to read or was suggested we read, and made some attempt to discuss it at the next meeting.

I might add that the literature that was at those meetings was also on sale in some of the bookstores in Los Angeles. There was a Lincoln Book Store there which had Communist and other material for sale. I was in the bookstore 2 or 3 times. There was also at these meetings material that was not Communist, at least not published by the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Lincoln Book Store known as a Communist book shop?

Mr. STENHOUSE. It wasn't known to me as such.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been evidence of that character presented to the committee.

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I wouldn't doubt it actually. But they sold things other than Communist Party literature. And it wasn't under the table. It was right out in the open. Anybody from the street could walk in and pick it up and read it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who invited you to become a member of that group?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't know, sir. At that time I was very active in the United Auto Workers. I felt that the United Auto Workers was doing a fine job in increasing production for the war. Their no-strike pledge was very loyally kept, and there were people there who always attended meetings, who were always ready to try and get other people to come to the union meetings, who were ready to do jobs for the union in the way of promoting blood-bank drives, and so on, getting people to register to vote, and the sort of things that I was interested in. Some one of these people who I had some knowledge of their actions asked me if I would go to such a meeting, and I said I would.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were the other members of this group of Communist Party persons employed in the same business in which you were employed?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, as far as I remember, there were possibly 2 or 3 of the group who were at the Bendix plant. I am not sure now. It is hard to differentiate.

Mr. MOULDER. You say you were interested in the same things that they were interested in, that is, getting people interested in elections and going to the polls to vote.

Mr. STENHOUSE. Sure.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you recall whether or not at that time the Communist Party had candidates for whom you could cast a ballot?

Mr. STENHOUSE. We weren't interested in it. We were voting Democratic. I was a Democrat.

Mr. MOULDER. The point I was trying to make, if you were interested in that party why did you join the Democratic Party? I don't understand why you affiliated yourself with a party that had no candidates for whom you could vote.

Mr. STENHOUSE. I didn't deliberately go out to affiliate myself with it. Somebody who was interested in it also, as a Democrat—and these things that were part of the war effort—suggested that I go to one of these meetings. And he had become a person I had some respect for because of his apparent adherence to the things that the majority of the American people were doing at that time. I accepted the idea and went to the meetings.

Mr. MOULDER. Were they Communist Party organization meetings?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't understand you.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you talking about Communist Party meetings?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No. I am talking about union meetings and how it came about that somebody invited me to go.

Mr. MOULDER. I am referring to the Communist Party meetings.

Mr. STENHOUSE. There were many meetings at that time, Mr. Chairman—union meetings; many union meetings I attended. I was very much impressed with the union.

Mr. MOULDER. Were the union meetings you attended Communist Party meetings?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I think we have got at cross purposes someway here.

I was trying to explain how it came about that somebody invited me to go to one of these discussion group meetings, and it was through the association with somebody whom I had some regard for in his union activity that I accepted an invitation.

Mr. MOULDER. Was the discussion group meeting a Communist Party meeting or merely affiliated with the Communist Party?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I am as confused as you are about that.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you know whether you were a Communist at that time?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, to be frank about it, I believe I signed a Communist Party card at some time.

I have a vague recollection of a card which had an American flag on it and some very patriotic phraseology about the war effort and the alliance between our country and the Soviet Union. It may have even had some words about the Communist Party on it. But it seemed to me entirely innocuous. In fact, again it appeared to be directed to the things I was interested in, in the war effort.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you pay dues to the Communist Party after signing the Communist Party card?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I believe there was some sort of dues structure, but I don't remember now how it worked. There were these materials for sale at the meetings, and money changed hands. I don't remember now how much of it was for books, how much of it was for dues.

Mr. MOULDER. Over what period of time did you continue to participate in such meetings and in what you then considered to be Communist Party activity?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I find it hard to set the actual dates, but it was, I think, some time during the latter part of 1943 and 1944.

Mr. MOULDER. And thereafter you have never in any way whatsoever participated in any Communist Party activity?

Mr. STENHOUSE. That isn't the truth, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. What would you say?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I also attended some similar meetings when I was in Washington, D. C.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:03 p. m., a recess was taken until 2 p. m. this same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION, MARCH 19, 1955

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order, please.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN STENHOUSE, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, JACK R. CLUCK—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Stenhouse, we were discussing the Communist Party branch or group of which you were a member in Los Angeles. Will you give the committee, please, the names of those who were associated with you in that group?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I am unable to give you the names, Mr. Tavenner. It is a long time ago, and I have been trying to remember. As I indicated to you the other day, if you give me some ideas of whom you think were present, it might refresh my memory.

MR. TAVENNER. I believe I told you that we would try to present you with a list of persons who had been identified in the Los Angeles area as members of the Communist Party, but we do not have that list with us, and we are unable to present it to you now. We may do so later in an effort to refresh your recollection.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

MR. STENHOUSE. I am willing at any time to tell you if any particular individual in my recollection was at those meetings.

MR. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, how you became employed in the United States Department of Commerce in Washington.

MR. STENHOUSE. Well, as I indicated, after I was obliged to have my hernia operation and get out of the defense work that I had been doing I sought occupation in a number of places. And somewhere along the line somebody brought my qualifications in the Far East to Congressman Ellis Patterson, and he referred it to Henry Wallace, and the appointment was made on that introduction.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you finally become head of your Section in the Department of Commerce?

MR. STENHOUSE. Chief of the Section.

MR. TAVENNER. Was that the Section dealing with China?

MR. STENHOUSE. That is right.

MR. TAVENNER. Did your activities in the Department of Commerce have anything to do with known Communists in China?

MR. STENHOUSE. No. The work that I was doing was related to the rehabilitation of trade. We were answering the inquiries of businessmen relating to regulations and economic conditions in China and the Far East. We prepared articles for the Foreign Commerce Weekly and conducted an economic analysis of the possibilities of reopening trade.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you tell the committee that you attended Communist Party meetings in the city of Washington?

MR. STENHOUSE. That is right.

MR. TAVENNER. Was that during the entire period of time you were in Washington?

MR. STENHOUSE. I can't be sure of the time again. But it was somewhere between the end of, I think, somewhere between the end of 1945 and the end of 1946.

MR. TAVENNER. How soon after your arrival in Washington did you become identified with the Communist Party there, and attend those group meetings?

MR. STENHOUSE. I can't place it. I know that shortly after I got to Washington I had another serious operation, and I was busy getting adjusted to my new work. Sometime about then I joined the Federal Workers Union.

MR. MOULDER. I did not understand you. You joined what?

MR. STENHOUSE. The Federal Workers Union.

MR. TAVENNER. Was it after you became a member of the Federal Workers Union that you first began attending Communist Party meetings in the District of Columbia?

MR. STENHOUSE. I can't be sure. I think it was.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you advance to the point of holding an office of any type in the union while you were in Washington?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I was a shop steward and collected dues from 4 or 5 people. That was all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which you were approached to identify yourself with the Communist Party while you were working for the Department of Commerce?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, again I think it was that one of the fellows in the union asked me to attend some of the similar sort of meetings that I had before. But it is possible that it was from some contact in Los Angeles. I am not sure about that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did that individual indicate that he knew you had been associated with a branch of the Communist Party in Los Angeles when he first talked to you about attending such meetings in the District of Columbia?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't remember whether he did or not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the person that contacted you in Washington?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, again I can't remember his name. But I have already told you who I thought it was in terms of his union function. He was a member of the grievance committee in that department.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give a better identification of the individual than the fact he was with the grievance committee?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I can give you a physical description to some extent. He was a fairly short fellow and dark, dark hair.

Mr. TAVENNER. About what age person was he at that time?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Oh, I imagine maybe 30, 32; something like that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did he live?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't know. He may have lived in Virginia. I say that because one of the houses where we met was in Virginia.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it his house?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I am not sure now.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he also employed by the Department of Commerce?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was his position in the Department of Commerce?

Mr. STENHOUSE. He was in the Balance of Payments. I am not sure of the actual name of the division. The work of that division was related to the study and report of international balance of payments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell us where his office was located in the Department of Commerce?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No. It was a huge building and I don't remember what floor it was on. It was in the main building.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it on the same floor as your office?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us his name?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No; I can't sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were all of the members of this group employees in the Department of Commerce?

(Representative Harold H. Velde entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. STENHOUSE. I am not sure of that. I think they were. I identified them in my mind at least with members of the Public Workers Union. And, while I was—well, I was going to say with that local. But I am not sure of that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the number of the local?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't remember. I only attended about, oh, not more than 4 or 5 union meetings. I dropped out of the union around the end of 1946, I think it was. And, as a matter of fact, I was extremely busy in my work and wasn't actually familiar with the organization of the union.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were active enough in the union to be made a steward.

Mr. STENHOUSE. That is right. I was a shop steward.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it your duty, as a shop steward, to represent the membership of the union in legitimate grievances?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, we never had any. And all I did was collect dues and turn them over to another fellow.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were any of the persons from whom you collected union dues members of the group of the Communist Party to which you referred?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No. No; I don't think they were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this a mixed group, men and women?

Mr. STENHOUSE. In the discussion group?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes; I think it was only men.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Four or five.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names, if you can, of any of the members of the group?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No, sir, I can't.

Mr. MOULDER. You have referred several times to the discussion group. Can you tell us what you discussed?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, we discussed international affairs, domestic problems; we discussed articles, as I indicated before, in Communist and other publications.

Mr. MOULDER. In any of these groups were you ever addressed by prominent Communist officials or leaders?

Mr. STENHOUSE. In those discussion groups?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. STENHOUSE. Not that I know of. They were all people, as far as I could determine, just like myself, maybe temporarily off on a wrong track. There was never any use of fictitious names as far as I know. I didn't use a fictitious name.

Mr. MOULDER. Will you repeat over what period of time did you attend discussion groups when you were in Washington?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, it was some time between the latter part of 1945 and 1946.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, it seems unusual to me that the witness cannot remember anybody's name, or the name of any person who attended these meetings.

This occurred less than 10 years ago, did it not?

Mr. STENHOUSE. About 10 years.

Mr. VELDE. And you cannot remember the name of a single person who attended those discussion groups?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No. And I have tried to do it, and I have offered to cooperate to the best of my ability with the staff of your committee, sir.

It is, as you say, 10 years ago. I have moved out into a different part of the world, an entirely different environment, new thoughts. Since I have been out here I have been working hard to establish myself economically, and I haven't had association within that time to remind me.

Mr. VELDE. Have you conscientiously tried to search your memory, to review the history of that period to determine whether you could name any persons who attended these meetings?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I have, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Did you say you have consulted with our staff to determine whether or not they can refresh your memory?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Of course, it still seems odd to me that you cannot remember one single person.

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, as a matter of fact, I can't remember the names of people whom I was in much more direct contact with in those days.

Mr. VELDE. You are a very intelligent person. There is no question about that. It does seem to me that you could remember someone that you went with. But can't you remember the occasion of your first visit to one of these discussion groups?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No.

Mr. VELDE. Or how you happened to get to the meeting?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't remember where it was. It was apparently in the house of one of the members of the group.

Mr. VELDE. Do you remember the physical surroundings of the meeting place? Apparently it was in a home of one of the members of the group.

Mr. STENHOUSE. One of the meetings, as I recall, was in, I think it was an apartment in one of the projects over on the Virginia side.

Mr. VELDE. On that occasion can you remember anyone discussing any particular legislation; for instance, legislation pending at that time?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No; I can't. They were very——

Mr. VELDE. Can you recall the name of any individual discussing any particular item?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No, I don't.

Mr. VELDE. By physical description?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No. They were very informal discussions. We just exchanged ideas back and forth. Somebody had read an article out of a paper or one of the publications, and we discussed it, and that was about it.

Mr. VELDE. Your impression was, however, that it was a Communist Party discussion group?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes, that is my impression.

Mr. VELDE. Did you discuss Marxism?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No.

Mr. VELDE. You cannot recall what you discussed except that you vaguely remember it was a Communist Party discussion?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I say we were discussing foreign affairs, domestic problems. I remember at that time the question of price control was

in people's minds, and I am pretty sure that that was one of the things we discussed.

They were nothing more nor less than an attempt, from a certain viewpoint, to study and explain, if you like, the phenomena we were living in.

Mr. VELDE. Have you no independent recollection whatsoever of how you happened to get into the first meeting?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Except that I was invited, as far as I remember, by this fellow that I have described.

Mr. VELDE. But do you remember his name?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I probably saw him not more than, oh, 20 times during the whole time I was in Washington. And there were many people in Washington whom I saw every day, whose names I can't remember.

Another thing, Mr. Congressman, we discussed the same topics from a different viewpoint with other people. And it is very hard to remember now exactly which topic was discussed at which meeting.

Mr. VELDE. I am sure, Mr. Stenhouse, it is very hard to remember exactly. But certainly I think that a person of average intelligence and a fair memory could remember at least one person.

Mr. STENHOUSE. If I could name them I would. And in offering to go over a list of names, I have done the best I can to cooperate with your committee.

Mr. MOULDER. When you filed your application for Government employment did you file Government form 57?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you remember the names of the persons you gave as references on that application?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, if form 57 requires references, I don't—Maybe it wasn't form 57. I don't want this to be misinterpreted.

Mr. MOULDER. It is a standard application form required by governmental departments.

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't recall any application in which I put references. It may be so.

Mr. MOULDER. But you did make a written application setting forth your experience and qualifications?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Oh, yes.

Mr. MOULDER. And was there an oath on that application?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Which you had to sign?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. And did anyone recommend you for this position to which you were assigned in Washington?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Somebody recommended me in the sense that they referred my name and qualifications to Ellis Patterson.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you know who that person was?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I am not sure who it was. We had a large number of friends from Los Angeles at that time, and it may have been one of the people that we were active with in that Democratic campaign. I think it probably was.

Mr. MOULDER. When you were made section chief, who was your immediate superior?

Mr. STENHOUSE. (Name deleted.)

Mr. MOULDER. Did he have anything to do with your promotion to that position?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I am sure he did.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you remember the names of the persons who were employed under your immediate supervision?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, there was one fellow just prior to my promotion. (Name deleted.)

Mr. MOULDER. I am not suggesting any of those persons be named in the record; I am testing your memory as to why you remember some people with whom you were associated and why you cannot remember the names of some other people with whom you were closely associated.

Mr. STENHOUSE. I can remember the names of many of the people in my division because we have exchanged Christmas cards since then, and I have seen some of them since then.

Mr. MOULDER. In line with Mr. Velde's questioning regarding the first Communist Party meeting to which you referred, how did you go? By car, by bus, or by train? Was it just as you say, a short distance? How did you get there?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No, I didn't say it was a short distance. I said it was in Virginia.

Mr. MOULDER. That is not far from the District of Columbia.

Mr. STENHOUSE. We lived in Maryland.

Mr. MOULDER. How did you travel to the place of the meeting?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I suppose it was by bus because we didn't have a car in those days.

Mr. MOULDER. You went by bus over there?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I say bus. I mean public transportation.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to make it clear we have no intention of having the public press or anyone else feel that any of the persons you mention who were associated with you in your professional work at that time are connected in any way with the Communist Party or any of its functions. We have hitherto tried to make that perfectly clear. The mere fact that you mention a name of one of your associates should lead no one to believe that he is in any way connected with it or has been connected with the Communist Party or Communist Party activities.

Mr. MOULDER. Did other employees in your section attend any of the meetings to which you have referred?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No.

Mr. MOULDER. In line with Congressman Velde's suggestion the names mentioned by you in that connection will be stricken from the record.

Mr. STENHOUSE. I want to make one clarification.

In regard to this matter of references, I don't want it on the record that I didn't give any references. If they were required I suppose I gave them. But don't remember now who I gave.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Another point, Mr. Chairman, in regard to this matter of remembering the names of the people who were at these discussion groups, there were not more than 3 or 4 meetings as far as I remember. There were very few in number.

Mr. MOULDER. How many meetings did you attend while you were in Washington?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Three or four; at the most, five; I can't remember exactly. They are very limited. I am trying to live back in those days and pinpoint when it could have been and where they could have been. And I can identify in a vague way three locations.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you issued a Communist Party membership card at any time while you were in Washington, D. C.?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't think so.

Mr. MOULDER. But you still refer to them as Communist Party meetings?

Mr. STENHOUSE. That is what I understood them to be. I am sure in my own mind now that I was just on the fringes of this thing, that—

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you not describe the meetings in Washington as being the same type of meetings you attended in Los Angeles?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I said they were similar.

Mr. MOULDER. Doesn't that mean the same type?

What difference was there between the meetings you attended in Washington and those you attended in Los Angeles?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I suppose one difference would be that in Washington, D. C., to the best of my knowledge, all the people present were members of the union.

Mr. MOULDER. Were they also all employees in the Department of Commerce?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Right.

Mr. MOULDER. Were any of them employees in your immediate section?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No.

Mr. MOULDER. The China Section of the Department of Commerce?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you, of your own personal knowledge, know whether any of the persons attending those meetings were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, they were at the meetings.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes; but that isn't my point. They were at the meetings, but do you know of your own personal knowledge whether or not they were Communist Party members?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Why I don't know how you identify that exactly. I don't recall seeing anybody's card. Again, there was some sort of dues payment.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you recall hearing any one of them say that they were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I can't remember now whether they did or not. I was there and I thought I was some sort of a member, and I just assumed—Maybe I shouldn't assume it. But I just assumed they were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you pay dues in this organization or in this group?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, again, it was somewhat the same arrangement as before. There were books to be bought and some sort of dues arrangement.

Mr. TAVENNER. To whom did you pay the dues?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I don't remember who the individual was. The money was just—somebody said "Well, here are the books." And the money was put on the table.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member of that group or attend meetings of that group?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, that is the question that you asked before, and, as I told you, I find it very difficult to pinpoint the time. I think I can limit it to somewhere near the end of 1945 because of the fact that I didn't get there until June and I had the operation, and then my family came out, and we were preoccupied with getting into a house and things of that sort. And I think it was—I was out of it by the early part of 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that you continued until the early part of 1947?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I say it was somewhere in that area. And I can't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which you stopped attending these meetings?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, the Communist publications that we were studying seemed to be overready to excuse the Soviet Union and criticize our country, and this didn't jibe with the ideas that I had had about the situation during the war. And I just stopped going and nobody ever tried to get me back in or approached me in any way.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have said that you cannot recall the names of any of these people or give any more descriptive information than you have because of the lapse of time, and the fact that you are separated now by long distance from the place you were then.

Did anything occur in 1946 or 1947 which would have served to refresh your recollection as to who these individuals were?

Something that would have called this matter very definitely to your attention and would have impressed itself on your memory. Do you recall anything of an unusual character having occurred?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I suppose you are referring to the fact that I was investigated or questioned by the FBI.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is right.

Mr. STENHOUSE. It may have recalled their names to me then, but it doesn't now.

Mr. VELDE. Did you give any names to the FBI when you were questioned?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No; I didn't.

Mr. VELDE. You said it may have recalled some of the names to you at that time but it doesn't now. If at that time it recalled the names of people with whom you had associated, why didn't you give them to the FBI?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I declined to state whether or not I had been a member of the Communist Party in Los Angeles.

Mr. VELDE. Do you mean you declined to state to the FBI whether or not you had been a member of the Communist Party in Los Angeles?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes. And, as far as I remember, he told me I didn't have to state. I can't be sure of that, but that is my recollection.

Mr. VELDE. Of course, you don't have to tell the FBI anything. But I am just wondering what was in your mind at that time—the reason why you did not give the FBI that information.

Mr. STENHOUSE. The reason was that I had, to the best of my knowledge and conscience, done nothing hostile to the United States. In fact, I thought that I had been a very loyal and active citizen in promoting the war effort.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did your employment terminate with the Department of Commerce?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I got my termination notice in October, and it was effective in November of 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the reason for termination of your services?

Mr. STENHOUSE. It stated that I was being relieved due to a reduction in force.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you stated then your next employment was with the United Nations. Is that correct?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, how you obtained your employment with the United Nations?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I was trying many avenues to get employment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am referring only to your employment with the United Nations.

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, there may have been a number of channels through which I got it, but I think that it may have been through the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why did you appeal to the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Because I had been a subscriber to the Institute of Pacific Relations, and I knew of the Institute as one interested in far-eastern affairs. And that, amongst several dozens of business firms and organizations, seemed to be a likely place to find an occupation in the area where I wanted to be.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before going to the Institute of Pacific Relations, did you have in mind that you desired to secure a position with the United Nations?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No; I don't think I did. In fact——

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the suggestion then made to you by the Institute of Pacific Relations that you seek employment with the United Nations?

(At this point Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room.)

Mr. STENHOUSE. I think it was suggested to me there that this commission was being formed—the commission was already in effect, but that there was this job to do on this subcommittee of trade relations and that I should contact a Dr. Lokanath. He was an Indian economist.

(At this point Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. STENHOUSE. I think that may have been the channel through which it came. I am not entirely certain. But I did contact him and got the appointment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the person or persons with whom you conferred in the Institute of Pacific Relations know of your Communist Party membership?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you furnish any references to the Institute of Pacific Relations when you went there to confer on the subject of your employment?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I think I probably did. You mean a sort of curriculum vitae.

Mr. TAVENNER. The real purpose of my question is to find out whether or not you were recommended to the Institute of Public Relations by any person who knew you had been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. STENHOUSE. No. I went there entirely on my own initiative.

Mr. VELDE. Did you know any of the defendants in the Amerasia case?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No.

Mr. VELDE. Had you ever met any of them?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know who it was from the Institute of Pacific Relations who first interested you in the United Nations?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I was interested in the United Nations myself.

Mr. VELDE. Naturally, I suppose you were. Was any one person at the Institute of Pacific Relations responsible for your employment by the United Nations?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No. I went to the Institute of Pacific Relations as one of many, many sources for a new occupation. And in the office of the Institute of Pacific Relations I was told that there was this opening. So I applied to the United Nations. I have at home a file about that thick [indicating] of letters to many business firms that I wrote to and had interviews with.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have any written memorandums or anything else in writing that would show your contact with the Institute of Pacific Relations at that time?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I have nothing to hide about my Institute of Pacific Relations contacts. I was a subscriber to the Institute of Pacific Relations. I thought they were doing a good job of objective reporting on the Far East. I was interested in it because of my background.

While I was in Washington, D. C., I went to several Institute of Pacific Relations meetings and discussion groups. It was only natural that that should be one place where I would go to find out if there was any firm or any organization that was associated with the Far East who would be interested in my background.

Mr. VELDE. Of course, I don't want to cast any reflections on the individual members of the Institute of Pacific Relations or any others you have contacted, but I do feel it would be valuable to the committee if you would make available the various letters you used when applying for jobs in order that we might search our records. Would you be willing to make those available?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Do you want me to tell you the names of the people in the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. VELDE. No. I am not particularly anxious for that. Again, I want to say if you do mention names of persons in the Institute of

Pacific Relations, it should be no reflection upon them whatsoever because you, as a former Communist, contacted them.

I am interested in finding out who you contacted or who in the Institute of Pacific Relations recommended you for a job with the United Nations.

Mr. STENHOUSE. I haven't been asked that question.

Mr. VELDE. I ask you that question.

Mr. STENHOUSE. If you want to know who it was in the Institute of Pacific Relations who I think gave me the information, I am very frank to tell you that it was Mr. Carter.

Mr. VELDE. Do you know his first name?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Edward C.

Mr. VELDE. Was he in his office at the time you went to the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. What did he do to promote your appointment in the United Nations?

Mr. STENHOUSE. He may have contacted Dr. Lokanath, for all I know. I think he possibly did.

Mr. VELDE. Did you get recommendations from members of the Institute of Pacific Relations other than Mr. Carter?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No.

Mr. VELDE. Did you have recommendations of any kind other than the Institute of Pacific Relations?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes.

The chief of my division gave me a very fine recommendation. A colleague who was in the China legal section gave me a very fine recommendation.

Mr. VELDE. Did either Mr. Carter or the chief of your division know that you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No; they did not.

Mr. VELDE. What type of formal application did you make for the position you sought and afterward obtained in the United Nations?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't recall now any formal application. I have in my files a letter of appointment, but I don't recall a formal application.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. After accepting the position with the United Nations, were you sent on a project to China?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before your selection for that project, were you interviewed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was it you were interviewed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation at which time you refused to advise them as to your previous Communist Party membership?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I think you gave me the date of that the other day. I had forgotten it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Don't you remember it?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No; I don't. But you said it was in 1946, and I think it probably was.

Mr. TAVENNER. So before you were selected for the position in the United Nations and, particularly for this project in China, you had

refused to give information to the Federal Bureau of Investigation as to whether or not you had been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, that is true, some nearly 2 years before. By the time I had applied for the position in the United Nations I didn't consider myself to be whatever it was I had been before.

Mr. TAVENNER. And no governmental agency, after the FBI came to see you, ever made any inquiry until the present time?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, that is not so.

Last September I was called by a Treasury representative, and he told me he wanted to ask me some questions. So I met him at my home and he started to ask me about the sort of work I did and whether I ever did much traveling. And in the course of that discussion I told him that I had been in Washington, D. C. I told him quite frankly what I had been doing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you tell him you had been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No. He didn't ask me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that the first time you had been questioned along this line?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes. But he did ask me a question did I know a certain individual in Washington, D. C. And the name of the man was—

Mr. TAVENNER. I would suggest that you not mention the name in public. The committee, I think, would want to know privately.

Let me ask you this:

In seeking that information from you, did it have any connection with the Communist Party?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't know what his intentions were at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think, Mr. Chairman, under those circumstances, we should not ask him to state the matter in public when we have no idea what it is he is talking about.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. STENHOUSE. You asked me if I had ever been questioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. I mean questioned about communism in a Federal agency and regarding the matters under discussion here.

Mr. STENHOUSE. I beg your pardon. I thought you meant had I ever been questioned by an agency of the Government in the interim.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course, we are not interested in whether you have been interrogated by someone in a Government department on matters not at all related to the functions of this committee. I understand you to say you have not been.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. STENHOUSE. The reason I thought you might be interested in it was that he did ask me a question which related to the Institute of Pacific Relations. And since it related to that, I thought that the committee should know about it.

He asked me if I had ever known (name deleted).

And first I couldn't remember the name. But then he said, "Well, didn't you ever go to a luncheon in Washington, D. C., sponsored by the Institute of Pacific Relations?"

And then I remembered that I had, along with several hundred or so other people, gone to such a luncheon.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, this being a matter about which we have no knowledge at all, I believe we are getting into a field that should not be explored in public without some investigation on our own part.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Tavenner, will you step up here, please?

(Mr. Tavenner confers with the chairman.)

Mr. STENHOUSE. May I make one concluding remark as to that last testimony?

Mr. MOULDER. At this time the name you mentioned will be stricken from the record until further investigation can be made of your last testimony.

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, this individual, I may say, addressed a large group of people in what was substantially an open meeting, and reported on—

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, in light of your ruling, I suggest we not go into that matter at all until the committee staff has had an opportunity to investigate the witness' last testimony.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. STENHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, may I make one concluding statement in regard to my last remarks?

When the man who was questioning me heard my report he then asked me why I was changing jobs. And I said I had no intention to change a job. And he said, "Did you apply for a job with the Treasury Department?"

And I said, "No."

And he said, "Well, do you know another John Stenhouse?"

And I told him I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the purpose of the project on which you were sent to China?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I think I have already stated that. Do you want me to repeat it, sir?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. STENHOUSE. It was to study and report on the rehabilitation of trade in the Far East.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that necessitated your travel in what part of China?

Mr. STENHOUSE. The headquarters were in Shanghai.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you spend all of your time in Shanghai?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No. I was in Nanking—well, while I was with that particular commission I spent all of my time in Shanghai.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was it that you went to Nanking?

Mr. STENHOUSE. After 3 months with the Economic Commission I then was with the Food and Agriculture Administration, and the Food and Agriculture Administration had an office both in Shanghai and in Nanking. And it was my duty, as administrative assistant, to supervise both offices.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state the dates you were stationed in Shanghai, and the dates you were in Nanking?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I can't do it. I was back and forth.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state the dates which divided your time between the two places?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I think maybe there is a mistake in my previous testimony as to dates.

Could the recorder—

Mr. TAVENNER. Rather than to take the time to look that up, if you give us what you consider to be the correct dates now, we will understand if that is different from what you stated before that you are thereby correcting the date.

Mr. STENHOUSE. I think I went to Shanghai in April—April, May, June, with the Commission. And then June, July, August, or something like that, with Food and Agriculture.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of what year?

Mr. STENHOUSE. 1948.

Mr. VELDE. Were you a member of the Communist Party at that time, Mr. Stenhouse?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you define your duties in the various assignments you held while in China?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, on the Commission it was research and analysis and reporting, and I wrote a report on the problems of reestablishing interregional trade in the Far East. And it was published by the United Nations—not under my name, but incorporated in a much larger volume.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you identify the volume and the article for the use of the committee?

Mr. STENHOUSE. It must have been published. I suppose it was published in 1949 probably.

Mr. TAVENNER. Under what caption?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I don't remember that. It was published by the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East as a subsidiary agency of the United Nations. But my material wasn't any single article. It was incorporated with a lot of other material by a lot of other people.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, your article was used as source material in the preparation of a report by the United Nations. Is that what you mean?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. During your assignment in China were you required to confer with known members of the Communist Party?

Mr. STENHOUSE. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Or Communists?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, I want to be frank here, but, first of all, I would like you to tell me in the context of Chinese people what the definition of a Communist is.

Mr. TAVENNER. Living in China as long as you did, you probably should understand that.

Mr. STENHOUSE. That is very difficult. The longer you live in China the harder it is to do it.

Mr. VELDE. Were you conferring with the economic leaders in China when you were on this assignment with the United Nations?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Was China under Communist domination at that time?

Mr. STENHOUSE. It certainly wasn't.

Mr. VELDE. When was this?

Mr. STENHOUSE. 1948.

Mr. VELDE. At that time then you didn't actually know whether you were dealing with Chiang Kai-shek forces or the Red forces?

Mr. STENHOUSE. At that time, Mr. Congressman, Shanghai was still under the Nationalists, and we dealt with officials of the Nationalist Government.

Mr. VELDE. Then you certainly wouldn't expect them to be Communists.

Mr. STENHOUSE. I wouldn't expect it, but there were many, I suppose—from what I know now—there were Communists in Shanghai at that time.

Mr. VELDE. As leaders in the Nationalist Government?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Well, the reason why I asked for the definition was we are always running into this problem of what is a Communist.

Mr. VELDE. There was nothing wrong in you conferring with Communists at that time; understand that.

Mr. STENHOUSE. I want to answer the question.

Mr. VELDE. Or with Nationalists either. That was part of your duties.

Mr. STENHOUSE. I asked for the definition because one of the men who was a consultant—and I didn't appoint him—to the group that I was working with was the chief of the Foreign Exchange Department of the Bank of China.

Mr. VELDE. Do you recall his name?

Mr. STENHOUSE. Yes. Chi Chio Ting.

Mr. VELDE. You certainly do have a good recollection as to some of these people, and you fail to recollect other people, chiefly Communists, with whom you were associated.

Mr. STENHOUSE. China is my field. I remember him because he was related to an area that I have since had contact with. And I remember him, too, because shortly after—I think it was shortly after I left Shanghai or while I was still there—he went over to the Peking Government. And, as far as I know, that is the only contact that I had in Shanghai with anything that you could call a Communist. And I don't know that he was.

Mr. VELDE. Certainly I am sure, as Mr. Tavenner has very well stated, that you, being acquainted in China, would certainly have a lot better knowledge of communism in China than probably any of us here would. I would like to ask if you recognized any of those associated with you on the United Nations Commission in China as being what you consider Communists?

Mr. STENHOUSE. The answer to that question is "No."

This particular individual was acting only in the capacity of a consultant. And I don't think he was actually a member of the United Nations. We were consulting with him and people like him because we were concerned with finance and foreign exchange and so on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that if the committee desires to go into the Chinese phase of that matter carefully that it be done at some other time. I believe, with the witnesses we have here, we would not be able to complete the work that is outlined if we attempt to go into that matter now. Besides, I think it is a matter we should discuss with the witness, at least preliminarily, before attempting to have a public hearing on it.

Mr. STENHOUSE. I would be very happy to do that.

Mr. VELDE. Let me say this, Mr. Chairman: I am disappointed at the witness' lack of memory concerning his early Communist associa-

tions and his inability to identify the members of the group with which he associated. However, I do feel that the information the witness possesses would be valuable to this committee, and he certainly should be given an opportunity to refresh his memory on any of these aspects as much as possible.

I would suggest our staff immediately prepare, or start an investigation into the matters related here today so we might hold a future hearing to secure more valuable information than we have today. And in that connection I would suggest that the subpoena to this witness be continued until some future date.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Stenhouse, the subpoena which was served upon you will remain in full force and effect until you are otherwise notified, or notified to appear here as a witness before this committee in further open session.

Mr. STENHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, may I make a short statement?

Mr. MOULDER. You will not be entitled to make a statement. You mean you want to ask a question?

Mr. STENHOUSE. I just wanted to refer once more to this matter of remembering the names. There were not more than 5 of these meetings. They occurred in a context where I was discussing the same sort of subjects in many different groups with many different individuals with many different points of view. As I said before, I cannot remember the names of people with whom I was in daily contact at that time.

I have moved out of that part of the country. I have very few associations with it. It is entirely impossible for me to drag names out of the air.

If the committee or its staff will be able to submit names to me I will do my best to say whether or not I can remember those people.

Mr. MOULDER. That is the purpose of continuing in force and effect your subpoena. And you are now temporarily excused as a witness.

(Whereupon the witness was temporarily excused.)

Mr. MOULDER. Call the next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dennett.

Mr. MOULDER. The name of the witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dennett.

TESTIMONY OF EUGENE VICTOR DENNETT, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, KENNETH A. MacDONALD—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dennett, I would like you to resume at this point the identification of individuals who were prominent in Communist Party activities in this area during the period that you were a member of the CIO council.

Mr. DENNETT. Mr. Chairman, there is one fellow that came to my mind after I left the stand here in connection with the Boeing plant, a fellow by the name of Sam Telford, who was very well known to me at that time.

Telford was very active in the organization of young people. His wife, Kate, was one of the principal workers in the office of the International Woodworkers of America. I happen to recall that because Kate and I had one thing in common—we had both attended church when we were young and had learned a number of hymns. And whenever social affairs occurred she and I would be singing hymns.

And it seemed to grate on the nerves of the comrades. They wanted to know if we didn't know some revolutionary songs, and we got a big kick out of irritating them with that.

I have quit singing, however. My voice doesn't suit for that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether the first name was Kate or Kay?

Mr. DENNETT. I knew her by the name of Kate, K-a-t-e.

Now the other day Mr. Wheeler asked me to think of the names of persons whom I knew, and I wrote down those which came to my mind in an offhand sort of way. Now in speaking of these names I want to again reiterate my personal moral objection to being called upon to bring to public notice the names of people whom I did know in the Communist Party for the reason that I think it is much better for them to speak for themselves.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment. If you can devise some plan for Communists speaking for themselves without the committee ascertaining their names we would be glad to have the suggestion.

Mr. DENNETT. Maybe when I get through they might want to.

Mr. TAVENNER. I might say the committee has to take the responsibility for asking you these questions, and realizes that it is not being generously given.

(At this point Representative Harold H. Velde left the hearing room.)

Mr. DENNETT. Well, I make the point of my objection for the reason that among nearly all of my friends are people who believe in bending over backwards the other way to protect the good name of any person. And I fear the consequences to the individuals.

I mean I just hate to be a party to doing anything which will in anywise injure any of them. I trust that the way in which this is done it will not injure them. However, I know that they are going to suffer some embarrassment as a consequence of it. However, the names that I am going to submit to you are persons who were known to me to be members of the Communist Party, and I am sure they knew what they were doing when they were members of the Communist Party.

These names are somewhat scattered. In order to expedite the business, I think I should go down through those that I have not previously mentioned to you, and make their identification so that we can get on to other matters which I know counsel wishes to cover.

Mr. TAVENNER. Please proceed.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DENNETT. Long ago, I knew a man by the name of Revels Cayton, who was the head of the International Labor Defense.

C-a-y-t-o-n is the last name, Revels—R-e-v-e-l-s, the first name.

Later, I knew Mr. Cayton as an official in the Marine Cooks and Stewards of the Pacific union.¹

Way back in the unemployed days I knew a man by the name of Iver Moe, I-v-e-r M-o-e.

Iver Moe's importance and significance is that he led an unemployed demonstration in Anacortes to a privately owned store which had foodstuffs in its stock, and the populace of Anacortes helped themselves. Mr. Moe was one of the leaders of that group, and was prose-

¹ This is a reference to National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards of the Pacific.

cuted for it. He was a member of the Communist Party at the time he did this. He thought he was doing the right thing. And, as a consequence, he was put on trial and was convicted and sentenced, and I know that he was turned against the Communist Party as a consequence of that experience.

(At this point Representative Harold H. Velde returned to the hearing room.)

Mr. DENNETT. Another person known to me in the unemployed days was a lady by the name of Mrs. Harter, H-a-r-t-e-r. Her significance to me is that she later became the wife of Alex Noral, before he left here. He took her with him as his wife to California.

She was a very active person in the unemployed movement, in the unemployed councils.

Later on, I knew Mr. Terry Pettus, who was the editor of the New World, and now the northwest edition of the People's World.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the name, please.

Mr. DENNETT. P-e-t-t-u-s, Pettus.

Mr. MOULDER. Are all the names you are referring to individuals who once were, or who now are, members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. They were known to me at the time I was in the Communist Party as members of the Communist Party, and I had Communist business with them.

Another person's name was Jim Cour, C-o-u-r or C-o-u-e-r. I am not too sure of that spelling.

But Jim Cour was in an editorial capacity on the old Voice of Action, which was the predecessor of the present paper, the northwest edition of the People's World. In between the name changed many times. At one time they had the New World, and, another time, it had several different names. But it was the same organization, the same subscribers, the same leadership. The change of name was intended to more adequately satisfy the attitude of the public toward political questions at that particular moment.

There was another one by the name of Bill Corr, but his was spelled differently, and it was C-o-r-r. Bill Corr was in the business management end of the paper, the Voice of Action.

Later I knew a person by the name of Huber, L. R. It seems to me that his first name was Louis, L-o-u-i-s. He served as editor of the Lumberworkers' paper for a long period of time, that is, the paper issued by the International Woodworkers of America, at the time that Harold Pritchett was the president of the organization.

Another person whom I knew was Charles Daggett. Charles Daggett I knew in several different capacities. At one time he was the city editor of the Seattle Star, a paper which went out of business in Seattle a great number of years ago.

Mr. Daggett later was known to me as an official in the inland-boatmen's union,¹ having become elected business agent in the San Francisco branch of the organization, and got into financial difficulties there; later went to Los Angeles. That is the last I heard of him.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have seen him since then, and he has testified before this committee and admitted his Communist Party membership.

Did you know him in this area in any activity within the news-paper guild?

¹ This is a reference to Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific.

Mr. DENNETT. Yes, I knew him in the newspaper guild, but I was not certain of his Communist Party activity at the time that I knew him then. I knew him as a Communist just as he left here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he active in that field in Los Angeles?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes, he was. He was very active as a newspaperman. He had a great deal to do with three other newspaper people whom I became closely acquainted with because of the official position that they held in the organization.

The first was a person by the name of Ellen McGrath. I have heard since that she is deceased. But Ellen McGrath was a sort of business agent for the newspaper guild when it was first organized here, and I knew her both in the official capacity as a representative of the newspaper guild and as a Communist actively operating in that field.

I knew her successor in that field, a man by the name of Claude Smith. Claude Smith was also known to me at that time as a Communist.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DENNETT. Yes, he is the one who was expelled from the Party at the same time that I was subsequently.

I knew another person by the name of Robert Camozzi, C-a-m-o-z-z-i. Robert Camozzi was the president of the Seattle CIO council at the time I was its secretary, and we had official business representing the council, and also we had official business as Communists.

In the building service union,¹ in addition to Mr. Jess Fletcher, whom I knew quite well because of his work on the district bureau of the Communist Party, I also knew a man by the name of Merwin Cole, C-o-l-e. Merwin Cole was one of the business agents of that union, and was quite well known to me because I had tried very hard to recruit him during some of the peace demonstrations that the youth from the university had organized downtown some time in the summer of 1936, I believe. Or perhaps it was 1935. It may have been a year one way or the other.

I also knew one of his associates, Mr. Ward Coley, who was a business agent in that union, C-o-l-e-y.

I knew another man by the name of Daggett. His name is Herbert Daggett. He is a brother of Charles Daggett. Herbert Daggett was known to me as a Communist in the National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association. Herbert Daggett was some official there. I do not recall exactly what it was at that time. I do not know as to his political position as of the present time either. I do understand that he is now the president of the Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association with headquarters in Washington, D. C. I repeat that I do not know what his political attitude is now.

He had an associate in the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association by the name of Ted Rasmussen. Rasmussen, I am not sure of the spelling. There are several different ways of spelling that name, and I am not positive of it. You will have to take the best guess you can make. But Ted was a member of the marine engineers organization, and I knew him as a Communist. I am not sure whether I am the person who recruited him, but I think I am because at the time I first started to work in the Inlandboatmen's Union Ted Rasmussen

¹ This is a reference to Building Service Employees' International Union, AFL, Local No. 6.

was the organizer of a dissident group of engineers who wanted to separate themselves from the existing organization. And I worked very hard to persuade him not to split the organization, and finally did prevail upon him, with the assistance of Harry Jackson, who was the Communist leader in the trade-union field here at that time, and either Mr. Jackson or myself recruited Mr. Rasmussen.

In the lumber organization I recall the name of Ted Dokter, D-o-k-t-e-r. Ted Dokter was a very able man in the lumber industry, and we thought he was very efficient, and we liked his work at the time I knew him. Later, after I ceased to know him personally and directly, I heard criticism of him to the effect that he did not follow the party line. So I don't know what has happened to him.

Of course, I knew Dick and Laura Law. Both are now deceased.

I have previously mentioned Helen Sobeleski and Gladys Field who were in the woodworkers' office.¹

One of my successors in the Seattle CIO Council was a man by the name of Arthur Harding. He was known to me. I understand he is deceased. I have not known of him for several years. But he was a loyal party member and so was his wife, a Jean Harding, J-e-a-n.

I have previously mentioned Ernie Fox, who was in the Sailors Union of the Pacific.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me suggest that we not lose time by repeating any of those that you have already named.

Mr. DENNETT. I knew his wife very well. She went by the name of Elsie Gilland, G-i-l-l-a-n-d. One day a very peculiar thing occurred to me. Mr. Harry Jackson came to me with a request. He said that he had received an application card from a Mr. Roy Atkinson, and asked me whether I felt Mr. Atkinson could possibly really mean to join the Communist Party.

I expressed my belief that I didn't think he could because I had never seen anything on his behavior which would indicate any sympathy toward the Communist Party. He said, "Well, we have received an application from him. We have received dues. Instead of doing anything about it we will not issue a card to him, and we will not let him be assigned to any branch. We are suspicious of that application. So we will not honor it. Mr. Atkinson was an active official in the CIO, and I thought that it was quite a ridiculous thing myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you thought that he desired to join the Communist Party in order to obtain information of its activities.

Mr. DENNETT. That was my opinion.

Mr. TAVENNER. Rather than to become genuinely a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. DENNETT. Yes.

Two persons who came to this area from the national office were known very well to me, Mr. Andrew Remes—and I know that that is not his proper name—but I don't know what his proper name was. That was a party name. And it was always spelled R-e-m-e-s, as far as I remember.

One of his associates, who also came from the East, was Mr. Lou Sass—S-a-s-s.

¹ This is a reference to International Woodworkers of America (CIO).

The committee will probably remember testimony from Mr. Leonard Wildman to the effect that he knew me in the Communist Party, which is correct. I did know him in the Communist Party.

I also knew his wife, Muriel. I also knew Elizabeth Boggs, who gave testimony to the effect that she knew me in the Communist Party.

I knew Mr. Harold Johnston, who was on this stand here this morning. Mr. Johnston was known to me as an active Communist and a close associate of Mr. Morris Rappaport.

Mr. VELDE. Was he a Communist at the time you left the Communist Party, to your best knowledge?

Mr. DENNETT. I had no direct knowledge as to what Mr. Johnston's position was after I went in the service. I did not know him after 1942-43. But I understand he was quite amused over my remark that Mr. Rappaport made short work of me. He was in a position to know.

I knew Mr. Glenn Kinney—K-i-n-n-e-y. I knew him over a period of a great many years. As a matter of fact, he was one of the first persons with whom I attempted to build a shop unit out in the steel mill. I wasn't employed there at the time. I believe he was. I was an official working here in town, doing full-time work for the party. Later on Mr. Kinney became a machinist, or I think he was a machinist actually at that time, but he became a machinist and rose to the heights in the machinists' union,¹ at least to the extent of being a business agent there several times.

In the old days there was an old man known to me by the name of F. S. U. Smith. And the reason we called him F. S. U. Smith was because he made one speech wherever he went, and that was to ask for people to be Friends of the Soviet Union, which was the name of an organization that he was very ardently supporting. He was a very loyal man to the party and did the best he knew how and the best he could.

These that I am scratching off are names that I have previously mentioned.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Dennett, I wish to apologize and thank you for your patience in being called and recalled, but we previously set the recess at 3:30. Do you mind at this time if we have a 5-minute recess and resume the hearings after it?

Mr. DENNETT. I would like to finish the names before we recess so we can take up the other business.

Mr. MOULDER. All right; let's proceed if you wish to do so.

Mr. DENNETT. A very old friend of mine with whom I went to school—I have no knowledge as to what has become of him now—but at the time I knew him in the Communist Party he was the section organizer in King County. His name is Al Bristol. Al was a very fine friend of mine, a very patient fellow. I knew his wife Frances quite well.

Another official that held the position of section organizer here was Clayton Van Lydegraf—V-a-n L-y-d-e-g-r-a-f. Clayton Van Lydegraf was one of the officials who took part in my expulsion from the party, signing the expulsion notice.

Another person whom I knew as a Communist was Mr. Earl Payne—P-a-y-n-e. The last I heard of him he had been assigned sec-

¹ This is a reference to International Association of Machinists, AFL.

tion organizer in the Portland, Oreg., area. When I knew him he had just returned from serving in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade in Spain.

Mr. Philip Frankfeld was sent here by the Central Committee to take over when Mr. Morris Rappaport was removed, or when it was known——

Mr. VELDE. When was Mr. Rappaport removed?

Mr. DENNETT. It was about the time of the outbreak of the war, shortly after the party had to make modifications in its practices because of the passage of the Voorhis Act. And Mr. Rappaport had been born in old Russia at the time of the Czar and was one of those continuing problems to the Immigration Department because no country would accept him as a deportee. And the Immigration Department could not dispose of him except to hold him in their jail. He was one of their problems. And the party, in preparation for its super-patriotic efforts during the Second World War changed its constitution to provide that only citizens of the United States, or persons who were eligible to become citizens of the United States could be members of the Communist Party. When that was adopted, Mr. Rappaport could not qualify, and was removed from office in the Communist Party.

Mr. VELDE. In 1941 or 1942?

Mr. DENNETT. Well, it was about in that period. I can't be too certain of it because I was beginning to fall into some disrepute myself, and was being left out of many activities and much information.

Another person well known to me in this period was Mr. John D-a-s-c-h-b-a-c-h. Daschbach was known to me as a comparatively young man who worked—I'll be blessed if I know where he worked, but I know he was always active in the Communist Party activities.

A longshoreman known to me that I failed to mention this morning was a rather heavy-set fellow who was known to me in a rather incidental sort of way. I know he was in the Communist Party, but I know little of any activity that he took part in, a man by the name of Wayne Mosio. I am not sure of the spelling. I think it is M-o-s-i-o. It may be z, but I am not certain.

Another longshoreman who was well known to me as a member of the Communist Party is a person who broke with the Communist Party and later changed his occupation from longshoreman to that of lawyer. He went to school while he was longshoring and qualified to be admitted to the bar.

I know that he was bitterly anti-Communist long before he became an attorney. I don't know whether you wish his name mentioned or not, but he was known to me and he certainly was known to the longshoremen. His name was Philip Poth, P-o-t-h.

A national leader of the party whom I failed to mention before was Mr. John Williamson, one of the Smith Act defendants who suffered penalty of conviction and incarceration. He served as the trade-union section or secretary, replacing Mr. Roy Hudson.

A person who was well known to me in my work of attempting to organize steel workers into the Communist Party was a section organizer, a man by the name of Charles Legg, L-e-g-g.

Another person known to me as a member of the Communist Party who later turned up as an informer for the Government and served as a witness for the FBI was known to me under the name of Doc

Dafoe. He was employed at that time in the steel mill at Northwest Rolling Mills.

Another person well known to me in the Communist Party many years ago who was rather mild in his Communist Party efforts when I knew him and who later turned against the Communist Party was Dan Adair, A-d-a-i-r. He was in Olympia, his home was Olympia,

I also knew his father whose name was Robin Adair.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean by that you are identifying his father as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes; both of them were members of the Communist Party at that time. Mr. Dan Adair, the last I heard of him, was bitterly anti-Communist and has left the State.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to remind you, wherever it is known to you that a person being identified has left the Communist Party, that it is only the fair thing to say so.

Mr. DENNETT. True.

I believe, sir, that covers all the names that I have not covered before.

Mr. MOULDER. We will stand in recess for 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will please come to order.

Proceed with the witness, please, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dennett, at the time you were a member of the CIO Council what union was it that you were representing?

Mr. DENNETT. I was from the Inlandboatmen's Union at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you have given us the names of those in that union who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. The only ones that I know——

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't want you to repeat them. I want to make certain.

Mr. DENNETT. The only ones I knew in the Inlandboatmen's Union—two are deceased.

Mr. TAVENNER. We are not interested in that.

Mr. DENNETT. I think that is of no value.

There was a person known to me in the Inlandboatmen's Union by the name of Gene Robel, who was a member of the Communist Party in the Inlandboatmen's Union. I think that he was one of the witnesses subpoenaed before this hearing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he testify several days ago?

Mr. DENNETT. I believe so.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at a later time become a member of the Steel Workers' Union?

Mr. DENNETT. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. What date did you become a member?

Mr. DENNETT. Some time in 1942, I think it was. Yes, it was in 1942.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, if any members of that union were known to you to be members of the Communist Party.

Mr. DENNETT. I have this recollection about that:

Remember now all of that transpired more than 7 years ago. I have been expelled from the party for the past 7 years, going on 8.

My recollection is positive about 2 persons. There are others about whom I have a very indistinct recollection, and I would be afraid to be positive about. But the two that I can be positive about—one's name was Andrew Marshall. He was referred to in Barbara Hartle's testimony as Andy. She did not finish the name. He was well known to me.

Another person was Alex Harding. H-a-r-d-i-n-g.

I know that there were around 6 or 7 active members of the Communist Party in the steelworkers at that time, but I am so uncertain about the other names that I would hesitate to mention them for fear I might be wrong and might speak of the wrong person.

MR. TAVENNER. There are other matters that I wanted to obtain information about, but there is apparently not time to do it.

I wanted particularly to inquire into examples of discipline exercised by the Communist Party over its members. We shall not have time to cover that even in a general way, but I know from what you have said during the course of your testimony that on a number of occasions the Communist Party disciplined you. You have told us of two occasions so far. I wish you would tell the committee of other examples of discipline.

MR. DENNETT. Well, the most important one was my expulsion and that of my former wife.

This occurred after my return from the service. You will recall that I have previously indicated that by the time I was inducted into service I was beginning to fall into some disrepute in the party, and the reason for that was that I had been actively engaged in trying to develop a struggle for equal rights for Negroes.

I was very much impressed by cases of police brutality against Negroes in the city of Seattle way back in 1940 and 1941. And some special cases had been brought to my personal attention, and I had developed a rather broad struggle on behalf of those people through my connections with the Washington Commonwealth Federation.

Of course, I was trying to build a considerable corps of Negro people in the Communist Party.

Without going into the detail of that, I simply want to say that my activities at first met with the approval of the Communist Party, but, with the outbreak of the war and the changed policy of the Communist Party, my activities met with the sharp disapproval of the party.

In other words, the party adopted the policy during the war of subordinating all other things in supporting the war. They had a slogan of "Subordinate the sectional or local interests to the national interest." This was quite a sharp change in policy.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you construe that as a sharp interest in the policy of the United States or of some other country?

MR. DENNETT. It was not with respect to the policy of the United States. It was intended to guarantee that the full strength of the United States would be brought to bear on the side of the Soviet Union in the war which was then raging with Nazi Germany; and to guarantee that it would be complete, the Communist Party ordered that the fight for equal rights for Negroes should be subordinated and that Negroes would have to wait for their equal rights, they would have to cease being troublemakers over this question. And they used that term. They used that term against me, that I was simply a troublemaker organizing diversionary interests.

Well, I felt that if the war that was being fought was worth anything it certainly was worth applying the principle of equal rights throughout the length and breadth of this Nation of the United States, especially when I knew of the heavy burden which the Negroes were carrying in parts of this country. And I knew that there were some attitudes around here which were extremely offensive to the Negro people. They certainly do object to segregation, and they certainly have a right to object to it.

It is my feeling, and always has been, that it is the duty of the white people to see to it that they are not treated as inferiors.

So I was pressing that point, and I defied the leadership of the district in the party to show me anything anywhere which justified their change of attitude.

For my militant determination on it I was falling into bad graces so rapidly that they removed me from the district bureau.

Before I went into the service I also quarreled with them over some of the literature published under the name of Earl Browder, under the title of "Victory and After," in which I challenged some of the contentions of Browder that it was possible to get along with some of the big capitalists of the United States in the interest of the war effort and forget the interest of the workers who were employed by those capitalists, because in too many instances the capitalists were making enormous profits in the war but the workers were not increasing their wages.

This was an issue which was of extreme importance to me. I was working in a steel mill and I felt that the steelworkers' wages at that time were altogether too inadequate. I think that history since has borne out the justification of my attitude in it, and I think the Communist Party policy which flip-flopped all over the place at that time has proven how unstable it was, and has proven that it was not genuinely trying to improve the condition of the workers.

Mr. VELDE. When were you removed from the district bureau of the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. Some time in 1941 or 1942, I believe it was. Then, of course, I went into the service.

Upon return from the service I tried to become as active as possible in the party work, tried to restore organization of the party apparatus. I was first advised by Mr. Andrew Remes when he came—he had just returned from the service ahead of me. He advised me that when he was in the service, evidently, Mr. Huff, who had been left in charge of the district, had permitted the entire district to collapse, because when he came back from the service—I am speaking of Mr. Remes—he told me there was not a single functioning branch of the Communist Party in the entire district, that it took him several weeks to get together the membership of any one branch. And he could only do it by leg-work, walking from house to house, to the old addresses of the people he knew before he went into the service. And he was dumfounded to find that condition existing.

When he had gone in the service the party numbered in the neighborhood of 5,000 in this district.

In other words, it was baffling to us as to why that thing had happened.

Later on I came to the conclusion that Mr. Huff was either representing the Federal Bureau of Investigation or somebody else who

was as opposed to the party as anybody could be because I couldn't account for any explanation for that development.

I soon found that I was running into a stone wall. Everything I proposed by way of reorganization or by way of organizational activities—I, for instance, felt that a fundamental policy of the party was to concentrate in the mass production industries, to concentrate in basic industries. I had always been taught that that was one of the party's chief concerns.

But, lo and behold, when I approached the district leaders asking for assistance to concentrate on making a strong party in the steelworkers, they said, "Oh, we're not interested in them. We have got other problems that are more important to us than just a bunch of steelworkers." Which was an attitude expressing to me a certain contempt for the workers, which didn't go very well because I have the greatest respect for men who have the audacity to try to work for a living. And I didn't like this business of people who were sitting up on top sneering, speaking about the membership in such a cursory way.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the question of Communist Party activity in veterans' organizations come up at that time?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes; it did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just touch on it very briefly, please, because we have very little time.

Mr. DENNETT. I was called to a fraction meeting of returned veterans to try to work out some kind of veterans' policy, and some of these veterans reported boastfully that they had just walked into some veterans' posts and had captured the leadership—no trouble at all.

I chastised them for being so naive as to think that the Communists could capture a veterans' organization when the purpose of the veterans' organization was to oppose the Communist Party. And I told them they were foolish to undertake such a task and that they shouldn't embark upon that policy. They told me I was nuts and that they knew what they were doing because they had the success of having captured a post.

Mr. TAVENNER. Time, however, proved that you were correct, did it not?

Mr. DENNETT. I think it did.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said both you and your wife were disciplined by the Communist Party.

Mr. DENNETT. That is true.

When I returned from the service it didn't take very long before rumor was circulated to the effect that I was alleged to be an FBI agent.

Mr. MOULDER. Was your wife a member of the Communist Party, too?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to say at this point that it is not the practice of this committee, and it is not my practice to ask a witness any questions relating to the activities of his wife. There have been several occasions when witnesses felt that, in order to give the complete story to the committee, it was necessary to speak of their wife's activities. But when they did, they did it on their own volition. Therefore, I am not asking you any questions with regard to your wife. If you mention her it is purely on your own volition.

Mr. DENNETT. To explain this disciplinary action I have to advise that my former wife and I were expelled from the party on the same document with the same explanation, the same reasons. The documentary evidence will bring her into this part of it.

And the account which I wish to make about the discipline against her is of far more importance than the discipline against me, although I am convinced that the purpose of the discipline was to get me out of their hair.

It seems as though some people in the district leadership did not like to be reminded of what the party policy used to be, and they objected to my reminding them of the zigzags which they had followed in the intervening period.

I was trying to find some way of bringing them to what I considered to be the official party position, and they seemed to have an entirely different attitude than I.

It resulted finally in a series of meetings with the district disciplinary body known to me originally as a control commission. The last I heard it was called a review commission. But, in effect, it amounts to a kangaroo court because, in my case, they started out with this rumor that I was an FBI agent, asked me to explain it, and all I could do was explain that my former wife had done something which they had authorized. And Mr. Huff admitted that he authorized it.

It is true that it ultimately led her to make certain reports which did contribute to the war effort by way of eliminating bottlenecks which she found in various parts of the war production industry. But this had been approved by Mr. Huff.

And then when I was on the pan, Mr. Huff first admitted that he had authorized her to engage in this activity, then later denied that he had done so, and used the allegation that I was an FBI agent as the excuse to cause my expulsion from the party, mainly and, in my judgment, solely because I was in total disagreement with them on policies relating to civil rights, policies relating to Veterans' Administration and veterans' work, and policies relating to organization in basic industry.

And the civil rights question was extremely important to me because in the organization of civil rights struggles it was my conception that if you are going to fight for civil rights you have to fight for civil rights for everyone. And when we attempted to organize a civil rights congress at the outset with that purpose in mind, and that as our declared effort, we were advised that the Communist Party could not afford to waste its time fighting for civil rights for everybody, that they were only interested in fighting for civil rights for members of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that one of the matters on which you disagreed with the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. It certainly was. Mr. Andrew Remes advised me personally that that was the situation, the party was in so much difficulty that it had to restrict its efforts to the defense of the Communist Party and that the Civil Rights Congress was created solely for that purpose.

I ceased to have any interest in it whatsoever, and, as a consequence, one thing led to another, and they finally expelled us with a notice on the early week of October 1947.

Mr. VELDE. You were removed from the party then. Membership was taken away from you for about the same reasons that you were removed from the bureau, from the district bureau?

Mr. DENNETT. That is true.

Mr. VELDE. That was about 6 years before?

Mr. DENNETT. That is true.

Mr. VELDE. Do you mean they spent all that time trying to change your mind about civil rights?

Mr. DENNETT. Well, there was an intervening period in which I was away, you know. I was in the service.

Mr. VELDE. That is right.

Mr. DENNETT. There were several breaks there.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you were in the service from 1943 practically through the year 1945.

Mr. DENNETT. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. I do not want you to go into great detail, but I believe the record should be a little clearer on the character of work in which your wife was actually engaged, which you say was authorized by the head of the Communist Party.

Mr. DENNETT. A stranger approached her and asked her if she would submit reports to him about any bottlenecks that she found in war production. He advised her that he had been informed that she was a very well-informed person, knew a lot of people, and would be capable of doing this work. She didn't know what to make of it. So she wrote to me while I was in the service asking my opinion, and I told her to hold off until I got back on furlough.

At that time I suggested to her that she take it up with the district leadership of the party, which she did, and got this approval.

The nature of that work she found—

Mr. TAVENNER. That had nothing to do with reporting to any agency of Communist Party activities as such?

Mr. DENNETT. No; it did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. But it was just a matter of reporting things which interfered with the war effort in industry?

Mr. DENNETT. That is true.

Among the things that she found, some of the outstanding things, was one occasion pertaining to the Takoma shipyards. She learned by various sources—friends that she knew in the labor movement—that the shipyard had been in operation for a period of around 10 months or more and still didn't have a ship on the ways. She made a number of inquiries as to how they could account for such a thing, and at one point she ran across a name that rang a bell with her.

She started to do a little probing, and found out that this name was the same as that of a person who had been removed from the navy yard some time before, either 2 or 3 years before, maybe. It might have been longer than that. But the person had been removed as a Fascist. He was known to be a member of a Silver Shirt organization.

Lo and behold, this person turns up as the production supervisor or superintendent in this particular shipyard.

Anyway, she submitted a report of all the information she had gathered on the subject. Within a couple of weeks' time this person was removed from his position, and within a short time afterward ships were on the ways in that shipyard and production started booming.

We could only draw a conclusion that her information had, certainly, some value.

Mr. TAVENNER. We will be very much interested to hear of other occasions, but, because of the shortness of time, we will have to move on.

The point is, that before undertaking that type of work your wife conferred with the leadership of the Communist Party and obtained approval.

Mr. DENNETT. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then take it up from there and tell us what occurred.

Mr. DENNETT. That was part of the story on which this allegation of FBI agent thing arose.

When I was first confronted with the story I recounted this whole thing in every detail to the leader of the section. The person was Mr. Jim Bourne. Mr. Jim Bourne told me to sit tight, do nothing, say nothing until I heard from the district.

I waited from March until June 1947, and still had no word from them. About sometime in June I was invited to a meeting which was called by the Communist Party for the purpose of preparing its defenses from the anticipated attack which would come from the Canwell committee investigation which was about to open.

I reluctantly went to the meeting because I felt I was under a cloud. However, I did go. I am glad I did because they did discuss the whole question of these investigating committees, and it gave me some insight as to my rights under the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States. It was thoroughly discussed in this meeting, and we understood that that was the sole and only real protection that a person had if he wanted to avoid testifying.

However, during the course of that meeting I spoke to a leader of the party, asking what was happening to my case. He advised me to speak to Mr. Huff. I spoke to Mr. Huff about it and Mr. Huff, as a result of it, arranged a meeting of the control commission.

The control commission called me to a meeting within a week's time. We reviewed the whole situation, the whole case, and I told them every single thing I knew about it. They asked me to submit a written statement. I did exactly that. I detailed everything that I knew about the situation in the statement.

I declined to sign the statement, however, because at that time I feared that their practices and methods were a little bit too loose, and I feared it might fall into the wrong hands and be used against me.

However, they accepted the statement, but they did not like what was in it.

They called me to another meeting, and at the second meeting they upbraided me and accused me of everything under the sun, and we finally broke up in rather a violent battle over whether or not they were trying to help the working class or not.

That occurred some time in August.

By October Mr. John Lawrie, the chairman of the control commission, visited our home, demanded our books, our party books.

We reluctantly gave them to him, protesting that we understood that a person had a right to be charged and tried, hear witnesses, and that sort of thing.

He said, "Well, you will get a statement."

About a week later we did receive a statement. The statement was an expulsion notice from the Communist Party.

No charges had ever been actually preferred, no opportunity for trial had been granted us, and we were blasphemed and accused of everything under the sun which is looked upon as a crime by the members of the Communist Party.

This statement was circulated to all the Communist Party sections, and evidently it reached other hands, because shortly afterward some security agencies of the Government called me up and asked me what was going on. I told them I didn't know, and I declined to talk with any of them, and I have never talked to any of them except on one occasion when Mr. John Boyd asked that I stop by the Immigration Bureau Office.

I did stop by there. He asked me a number of questions then, and I refused to be of any assistance to him whatsoever at that time. That was shortly after the expulsion.

Now, the most important part of this disciplinary action is what I have to say at this time, because immediately after receiving this notice, we received rumors to the effect that the Communist Party members in the union of which my former wife was the president, which was the United Office and Professional Workers of America, Local 35—I heard the rumor that they were going to come into that meeting that night and demand her removal from the organization.

MR. TAVENNER. You mean that the union members were going to demand—

MR. DENNETT. I heard the Communist Party members in that union were going to make a demand in that union that my former wife be removed from office and be removed as a member of that union because the party had disciplined her.

The situation in that union was very peculiar. It was a union of about 65 members, and there were no more than a half-dozen persons in it who were not members of the Communist Party.

That seems incredible, but the reason for it is that most of the persons who were members of the union were working as secretaries in various union offices, or were working for some individual employer with whom there were no collective-bargaining contracts and there were no regular functions of a union. It was simply a home where these people could pay dues and use the union label wherever they wanted to for their own convenience. As a matter of fact, that is the reason why the Communist Party usually uses the union label on its circulars or letters, because it has members in the Communist Party office who were members of that union.

This particular expulsion drew the attention of the Communist Party to us, and especially to my former wife. They knew that the steelworkers union was bitterly anti-Communist. They didn't dare to try to make any approaches to the steelworkers union to have me thrown out, but they did have absolute control, they thought, in the office workers union, and they thought they would take their revenge on my former wife by proceeding against her.

When I learned of this I went to the office of the party and asked for the district leadership to give me an audience.

They treated me like scum under their feet when I went in their office because I had just been expelled. However, I did speak to them and advised them that I heard this rumor, that I urged them not to

be as foolhardy as that because to do so would attract public attention. And if that was done it would do irreparable harm to that union and might also bring down a great deal of criticism on the entire labor movement for something for which the labor movement itself was not at fault but was something for which the Communist Party was at fault.

I, therefore, asked them if they would be so considerate as to allow my former wife to resign her position if it was inconvenient for them to have her in that position.

She had no desire to remain in it any longer than necessary. She thought she was rendering them a service and thought she was rendering the union a service by holding that position.

But they said they would not take their advice from expelled members.

So they proceeded that night to introduce a mimeographed proposal preferring charges against my former wife.

Now I have borrowed this from a person who has kept the file because he was prevailed upon by my former wife and myself to act as her counsel during the course of that proceeding, and he kept a complete file.

I have here the original of the charges that were preferred against her, and the substance of it is simply this: That they were asking for my former wife to be expelled from that union and from the office of president in that union simply because she had been expelled from the Communist Party on a kangaroo court proceeding. And the names of the signers are here and in their own original handwriting. Some of them have been called before this committee before.

Mr. VELDE. Is that for expulsion from the United Office and Professional Workers Union or from the party?

Mr. DENNETT. No. This is the charges that were preferred in the Office Workers Union by members of the Office Workers Union who were also—they must have been members of the Communist Party. I didn't know of them of my own knowledge, but my former wife did, and it is in their handwriting. Their names are there in their own handwriting. And I think the committee would like to know this and have this as a matter of record.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the names into the record.

Mr. VELDE. If you are sure that they are all members of the party. (The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. DENNETT. My counsel raised the same question, Mr. Tavenner, that inasmuch as I cannot testify of my own knowledge about their membership, that perhaps it is not proper for me. However, this is the document which was used in that union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you a few preliminary questions.

Were you given a written notice of expulsion by the Communist Party?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes, we were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you identify language in that expulsion notice as being virtually the same language as in the notice of charges given by the union to your wife?

Mr. DENNETT. It certainly is. In both instances they accuse her of the crime of being an informer for the FBI.

Mr. TAVENNER. We will not take time now to analyze those documents, but I would like for them to be in evidence, and, in light of the fact that the names signed have not been shown by evidence to be members of the Communist Party, I ask that that part of the document be deleted until investigation has established whether or not they are members of the party.

Mr. MOULDER. As requested by counsel, without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like for the document to be marked "Dennett Exhibit No. 10."

(The document above referred to, marked "Dennett Exhibit No. 10," is filed herewith.)

DENNETT EXHIBIT No. 10

We, the undersigned, prefer charges against Harriette Dennett, President, United Office and Professional Workers of America, Local 35, for violation of the Constitution of the National Union under the following Articles:

ARTICLE II, Section 3. "No person whose interests are deemed to lie with the employer as against the employees shall be eligible for membership."

ARTICLE II, Section 5, Obligations of Members. "... to bear true allegiance to, and keep inviolate the principles of the union; ... and to promote the interests of our members in harmony with the best interests of our country."

ARTICLE VI, Section 9, Obligations of Local Union Officers. "... to perform all your duties as required by the laws of the Union and the instruction of the membership ... and that you will do everything in your power to forward the interests of the organized labor movement."

We have certain evidence clearly revealing that Harriette Dennett has made regular reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation over a long period of time for which she has received payment. We are convinced that no honest trade unionist would have connections with any police body, especially the FBI, and still serve the best interests of the Union.

Let us examine the role of the FBI. Organized labor recognizes that law enforcing agencies are absolutely necessary in the protection of public and private property, prevention of crime, and safeguarding our welfare. However, various police bodies, both Federal and local, have always allied themselves with the employers in economic struggles. In strikes, the U. S. Army and National Guard have smashed picket lines and arrested union leaders, and, in conjunction with the courts, have framed them, had them imprisoned, deported, and even executed.

The FBI especially, acting as the undercover arm of these police forces, while it has done a commendable job in the apprehension of criminals, has constantly used its prestige and power in aiding employers and local police agencies in their efforts to weaken and destroy unions by hunting down progressive and militant trade unionists and having them blacklisted from their jobs.

In the Bridges Case, witnesses were either paid or intimidated by the FBI to testify falsely. They did not hesitate to use wiretapping, dictographing, and other devices, although illegal. At the present time, John Santos, long-time leader of the Transport Workers Union, is undergoing an ordeal very similar to that of Bridges. Strenuous efforts are being made to deport him because he has earned the enmity of powerful transit and utility corporations. He is charged with being an alien "red." And, once again, the FBI is playing a key role in this hearing by rounding up questionable anti-labor characters to testify against him.

According to the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee, the Pinkerton Detective Agency was found to have 300 operatives enrolled in unions as members, of whom at least 100 were union officials—of them 14 presidents of locals, one national vice-president, 14 trustees, and 20 local union secretaries.

We are at present witnessing an attack upon a union in our own city as a result of the combination of discredited labor leaders, the un-American Canwell Committee and the Seattle P-I and its FBI agent and strike-breaker, Fred Niendorff.

Today, Labor is faced with an all-out offensive of the profit-greedy NAM. They are determined to bring wages down while continuing to raise the cost of

living. This attack on the peoples' living standards is most serious to the thousands of greatly underpaid white-collar workers.

To accomplish this union-busting program, the most vicious antilabor legislation, such as the Taft-Hartley law has been passed, and the Un-American Activities Committee, the little Dies Committees and numerous other government agencies—all in conjunction with the FBI—are engaged in a witch-hunt against labor.

Let us recall that it was not until trade unions were made impotent in Germany that Hitler dared to embark on the road to concentration and extermination camps.

The National CIO has condemned the Department of Justice for conducting a "gumshoe" probe of CIO political expenditures. President Philip Murray has reported "furtive operations and dramatic unearthing of clues by the FBI . . . which can have only the objective of harassing and intimidation."

Anyone working with the FBI or with any of the above-named antilabor committees or against the best interests of the union must clearly be labeled an enemy of labor and removed from membership in any labor organization to which he may belong.

Therefore, in pursuance of the procedure established by Section I, ARTICLE XV, which states that any elective or appointive officers of a local union may be removed from office subject to provisions of this Article for any violation of this Constitution "or because of the commission of an act impairing the usefulness of the organization," we are presenting these charges, and demanding the expulsion of Harriette Dennett from UOPWA 35. We call upon our Union to immediately set up a trial committee to investigate these charges and report back its findings to a special membership meeting to be called for action by the membership.

uopwa 35 cio

Mr. TAVENNER. And I would like also to introduce in evidence at this time the expulsion notice that was given you, and ask that it be marked "Dennett Exhibit No. 11."

Mr. MOULDER. As requested by counsel, without objection, it is so ordered.

(The document above referred to, marked "Dennett Exhibit No. 11," is filed herewith).

DENNETT EXHIBIT No. 11

NOTICE OF EXPULSION

To All Sections, Clubs, and Members of the

Northwest District Communist Party, U. S. A. :

This is to notify all Sections and Clubs of the expulsion from the Communist Party of Eugene V. Dennett, Harriet Dennett, and Claude Smith.

In the case of Eugene Dennett and Harriet Dennett, the expulsion is based upon violation of the conditions of membership in the Communist Party as set forth in Article 9, Sections 1, 2, and 4 of the Constitution of the Communist Party, U. S. A., based upon the following facts established by the District Review Commission :

1. Admitted employment of Harriet Dennett by an agency of the F. B. I. and the submitting of regular reports to said agency over a long period of time, with the knowledge and consent, and direct participation of Eugene V. Dennett. This was established by his admission of personal contact with a known agent of the F. B. I. and his concealment from the Party of Harriet Dennett's activities and his own personal contact with the F. B. I.

2. Admitted personal and political relations by Eugene V. Dennett with known Trotskyites with established participation by Harriet Dennett.

3. An established record of anti-party, disruptive, and provocative activity by Eugene Dennett on numerous occasions and by Harriet Dennett in several instances.

In the case of Claude Smith, the expulsion is based upon violation of the conditions of membership in the Communist Party as set forth in Article 9, Sections 1, 2, and 4 of the Constitution of the Communist Party, U. S. A., and based upon the following facts established by the District Review Commission :

1. Admitted participation in the preparation of the reports submitted by Harriet Dennett to the Agency referred to above as well as sharing in the payment for those reports and concealment of these activities from the Party.

The District Review Commission wishes to call to the attention of the Party membership and its organizations the necessary conclusions from these facts. First, in this case as in many in the past, a negative, carping attitude toward the Party and its program has upon investigation disclosed enemies of the Party and the working class.

The same thing must be said of toleration and association with Trotskyites who are simply fascists hiding behind "left" phrases. While such attitudes may be due to lack of understanding in new members, in the case of experienced long time members it can only be regarded as conscious assistance to fascism and to the agents of fascism. It must be noted also that the personal record of these people is marked by individualism instability and extreme egotism.

The District Review Commission also wishes to point out that it is necessary to learn to distinguish between honest differences of opinion which we have to constantly resolve by discussion and majority decision and disruptive, dishonest attacks upon the program activities and leadership of the Party, which is the earmark of the provocateur and agent of the enemy. Only by more resolutely defending and fighting for the program of the Party can we make this distinction clear. Only by becoming more alert to the smell of anti-Party poison can we root out these disrupters. Only by fighting for the unity of the Party and testing our cadres struggle can we create guarantees that such elements will not remain long in the Party or be able to steal into its posts of leadership, and that the damage that they do will be reduced to a minimum.

Harriet Dennett is at present holding the position of President of the Seattle UOPWA Local Union No. 35. Eugene Dennett is a member of the Board of Control of the NEW WORLD and a member of the Steelworkers Union. Claude Smith is at present editor of the Washington State CIO news.

All Party members are warned against personal or political association with these expelled members and to give them no consideration or comfort in the excuses and protests they can be expected to make against the expulsion action which was ordered carried out by unanimous vote of the Northwest District Committee in executive session on October 6, 1947.

Signed :

HENRY HUFF,
District Chairman,
C. VAN LYDEGRAF,
District Orig. Sec'y,

For the Northwest District Committee Communist Party, U. S. A.
nopwa No. 35.

Mr. VELDE. There is one question I would like to ask you, Mr. Dennett, about your expulsion and your wife's. You probably recall the argument that took place within the ranks of the Communist Party during the change from the Communist political association to the militant type of organization it was before.

Did you or your wife engage in any of those arguments after the receipt of the Duclos letter?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes, we did.

Mr. VELDE. I am interested in that. if you will please be as brief as you can.

Mr. DENNETT. I will do my best, sir.

I was still in the service at the time. This occurred in New Orleans. My wife was still doing this same work in New Orleans.

Mr. VELDE. Was that in the middle of 1945?

Mr. DENNETT. That is right, in May and June of 1945.

And with the publication of the Duclos letter in the Daily Worker, which my wife was a subscriber to at that time, we observed that something tremendous was taking place within the party. And she made contact with some of the party people in New Orleans.

When they found that we had an interest in it, they invited us to the meetings where this discussion took place. And I was quite

startled to find that the general criticism was mainly directed at the bureaucratic attitude and dictatorial policies pursued by Mr. Earl Browder. I was flabbergasted because I did not have that conception of him, and I was quite surprised as a result of it. And, of course, you know the rest of the story, which was published.

Mr. VELDE. In other words, you and your wife both took the side of Earl Browder?

Mr. DENNETT. I wouldn't say that my former wife took the side of Earl Browder. I wouldn't say I took the side of Earl Browder either because I was not in the party at the time. I was simply a visitor invited, and I was mainly surprised. I questioned the reports that people made. I didn't pass judgment on it. I simply could hardly believe the criticism which I heard.

Mr. VELDE. It appears to me from your testimony that you were probably sort of independent in this matter of following the Communist Party line as handed down from Soviet Russia, and that was probably one of the chief reasons why you were expelled. Is that not right? You would not follow the party line? You thought for yourself.

Mr. DENNETT. I thought I was following the party line, and I thought the leaders around here were zigzagging all over the lot, and they didn't know what the line was. They thought I was nuts. I thought they were nuts.

Mr. VELDE. Maybe you were just like Trotsky or Lovestone. You just didn't happen to be in the ruling class as far as the party line was concerned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, we have just checked the names on exhibit No. 10, and find that all of the persons whose names appear there have been identified in testimony before this committee as Communist Party members. Therefore, I see no reason for restricting that document in any way in its introduction in evidence.

Mr. MOULDER. It is so ordered. Do you wish to read the names?

Mr. TAVENNER. I desire the witness to read the names.

Mr. DENNETT. Alice Kinney, known to me before as Alice Balmer, B-a-l-m-e-r; Trudi Kirkwood, Helen Huff. Helen Huff was known to me as the wife of Henry Huff, who was the district organizer of the party, and Helen Huff was one of those persons to whom I spoke when I requested that they allow my former wife to resign, but they would have nothing to do with that. They wouldn't allow it. They wanted to make an example of her. Hallie Donaldson, Vivian Stucker, S-t-u-c-k-e-r, Jean R. Hatten.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Dennett, are there any other facts relating to your expulsion which would be of interest to this committee?

Mr. DENNETT. I think, Mr. Tavenner and members of the committee, that there are probably many. But, in view of the pressing time, I think that this is sufficient to give you the picture, and, if you want to go into more detail at a later time when you have more time available, I think maybe we could do that. I have said all I think I need to say at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. After your expulsion have you been identified with the Communist Party in any way?

Mr. DENNETT. No, sir; I have not.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee had information indicating that you may possibly have become a member after your expulsion, or even

prior to that, of the Socialist Workers Party. And the information that the committee had in that respect was a nominating petition of that group signed by you.

We would like to know whether you were at any time a member of the Socialist Workers Party.

Mr. DENNETT. The answer is very simple. I was not. I never have been a member of the Socialist Workers Party.

The occasion for that signature on that nominating petition is the result of a request from the Socialist Workers Party leader, Mr. Daniel Roberts, who was the leader at that time, that I sign a nominating petition to permit their candidates to get on the ballot.

In the State of Washington a provision is in the election laws allowing nominating petitions to be signed by a minimum of 25 people who are qualified voters who did not vote in the primary. In other words, it is equivalent to casting a vote.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did the Socialist Workers Party endeavor to recruit you as a member?

Mr. DENNETT. Yes. Mr. Daniel Roberts tried time and time again to recruit me, thinking that my vast experience in the Communist Party gave me plenty of background to qualify me if I would simply change my thinking with respect to certain fundamental ideas which were points of difference between the Socialist Workers Party and the Communist Party. However, I never was able to accept all of the ideas which Mr. Roberts and some of their national leaders to whom he introduced me—I could never resolve all of the policies which they advocated to my own thinking.

And the whole experience caused me to go back and question and challenge the validity of the theoretical basis upon which the Communist Party was organized and upon which it operated. And it caused me to reach the conclusion a long time ago that it is very inadvisable for anyone to commit his political fealty to anyone or any organization that he doesn't understand in full. And I do not to this day completely understand the Socialist Workers Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. I noticed in some of the earlier documents introduced in evidence that reference was made to you when the Communist Party was critical of you as being a Trotskyite.

Mr. DENNETT. That is true. Remarks were made about me on a number of occasions. And, as near as I can make out, the reason for it is I was asking embarrassing questions. It seems as though Trotsky did that against Mr. Stalin in the Soviet Union—when everyone especially was interested in a democratic procedure that went contrary to Stalin's rule. His rule was that you had to accept his decision whether you liked it or not. And that is the rule of democratic centralism, a principle with which I am in total disagreement today. I thought for a long time that that was a wonderful principle. I had read Lenin's writings on the subject. I thought that his explanations were quite good. But once I had had service in the military, once I knew what military organization was like, I recognized the principle of democratic centralism as the application of military rule to civilian life. And I am strictly opposed to it.

Mr. TAVENNER. In light of your experience in the Communist Party, and from your study of the Socialist Workers Party, would you please state as briefly as you can the principal differences between these organizations as you understood them.

Mr. DENNETT. One of the principal differences lies in the fact that the Socialist Workers Party people accused the Communist Party people, in particular Stalin and Stalinism, of having deserted the principle of socialism, of internationalism, accusing Stalin of degenerating into nationalism. That is when he developed the so-called theory of the possibility of developing socialism in one country alone.

Mr. TAVENNER. That country being the Soviet Union.

Mr. DENNETT. That country being the Soviet Union.

The Trotskyites maintained that Stalin was thereby deserting the cause of internationalism and that he would think first of the interests of the Soviet Union, and later, if at all, subordinate the interests of the world working class to building the Soviet Union at the cost of letting the working class in other countries go by the boards.

In other words, if a revolutionary situation developed in some other country Stalin would exert his power to prevent the success of the revolution in that country for fear that it would detract from the success of the Soviet Union.

Mr. TAVENNER. Unless, of course, such a revolution would strengthen his power and his regime in the Soviet Union. Wouldn't you make that qualification?

Mr. DENNETT. That might be a consideration. But all history, all experience since the Second World War would indicate that Stalin at no time approved successful revolutions in any country. He opposed revolutionary effort of the Yugoslavs. He opposed the revolutionary effort of the Communists in Greece. He opposed the revolutionary effort of the Chinese Communists. He even made commitments, and part of the deal which people seemed to be so concerned about at Yalta and Potsdam and Cairo and Casablanca involved Stalin making commitments to Roosevelt and Churchill to the effect that the Soviet Union would use its influence to suppress the revolutionary effort of the workers in the various countries that were on the brink of revolution.

And that is why when the Soviet Red Army marched into those border countries in eastern Europe they did not attempt to create a Soviet revolution. They, instead, created something they called people's democracies. But they were established in some instances with the aid of the Red army marching in, and the people in those countries had nothing to say about it.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the attitude of the Trotskyites as to Stalin's agreement with reference to Greece, for instance?

Mr. DENNETT. They accused him of betraying the working class not only in Greece but in the Soviet Union because he was ruling in the Soviet Union with such an iron hand that workers there were being suppressed. They were being forbidden from enjoying the efforts they were putting in to build a Socialist country. In fact, they were being deprived of the fruits of what was intended to be socialism. In fact, the Trotskyites, as I understand, their philosophy in the matter is that the Soviet Union has suffered from an arrested development—it is not truly Socialist; it has not been permitted to become Socialist, and that the biggest crime Stalin committed was to pretend and hold the Soviet Union up to world view as a Socialist country when, in fact, it was not a Socialist country.

I also came to the conclusion, as a result of some of the theoretical material I read in about 1946, where Stalin was insisting that, in-

stead of the authority of the state withering away as predicted in the writings of Engels and Lenin, that Stalin insisted that the authority of the state must increase, that the police power must be increased in the Soviet Union to make sure that they would continue in an ordered fashion, which certainly was contrary to all the earlier writings on the theoretical subject of the development of the state.

Mr. TAVENNER. It has been demonstrated time and again, has it not, to your satisfaction, that Stalin has endeavored to use international communism as a tool in order to advance his own foreign policy which necessarily, of course, meant his strengthening his own position in the Soviet Union.

Mr. DENNETT. It certainly is.

Mr. TAVENNER. There are many other matters that I would have liked to have gone into with you, but I must terminate the examination. I do not like to do so without giving you an opportunity to state anything that may be in your mind about the effect of your experience in the Communist Party or your present attitude toward the Communist Party.

I am not insisting that you do, but I merely want to give you the opportunity.

Mr. DENNETT. My counsel has already advised me to be very brief. I am very appreciative of the suggestion because the hour is late, and I want to thank you for the opportunity you have given me to make a statement.

The only statement I would make at this time is some elaboration over what I started to say earlier when we were talking about what steps to take to protect yourself against this sort of deception.

I am sure that some people in hearing the account which I have given by way of testimony before this committee may gather the impression that I learned quite a little bit about deception. And I am sure that some people were quite firmly convinced that I would do nothing except deceive this committee when I appeared before it.

I wish to assure you that I have testified to the best of my ability about the facts that I know and facts which I can substantiate with documentary evidence in my own records.

Those records are available to the committee. They have been made available to the committee, and I understand that you intend to have the United States marshal pick them up and place them in protective custody where they will be available for me for further study and also to yourself.

I simply recite that as some indication that in my testifying before you the only reservation that I have is that I still have some misgivings about this kind of procedure because I fear that we are needlessly hurting individuals when we name them in such vast numbers as the committee has called upon me to do.

I think that some means needs to be found to change that procedure. And I believe that there will be more information of value to convincing the general public and to assisting the Congress, by way of its legislative effort, if a better effort is found.

And I hope that you will seriously pay attention to the recommendations of the American Civil Liberties Union in this regard. I think their recommendations deserve your worthy consideration.

I think, gentlemen, that is about all that is needed for me to say at this time. I can only say that I am available for whatever further

work that you wish to do with me. I do not want anyone to think that they are going to make a professional witness out of me. I have no intention of being a professional witness. I would like to be able to live in peace and quiet because my own health will not permit me to do all the other things that need to be done.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Dennett, as chairman of this committee, and on behalf of counsel, Mr. Tavenner, and Mr. Wheeler, and I believe I should presume to express appreciation also on behalf of the full committee on Un-American Activities, the Congress of the United States, and the people of America for your honest, courageous, patriotic, and convincing testimony and information concerning communistic activities.

Your comprehensive and intelligent testimony is not only revealing but has been ably presented by you in a patriotic and conscientious spirit and duty to your country and also to yourself.

We commend you for your appearance and conduct before this committee as an example—and I emphasize this—as an example of how any and all former Communist Party members can clear themselves of any doubt whatsoever concerning their loyalty to the United States of America.

And, speaking for myself, I am glad I had an opportunity to observe your conduct on the witness stand, and, having heard your testimony, I am deeply impressed by the valuable information you have given to the committee.

Mr. Velde, do you have anything?

Mr. VELDE. Yes, Mr Chairman. I don't think I can add too much to your very fine statement.

Let me say that I concur with our distinguished friend from Missouri in his statement about your testimony.

I happened to be here last year when you refused to testify. I think I mentioned earlier—last Thursday—that you would have a lot more friends after you got through testifying than you had before or during the time that you appeared here last time, and I sincerely hope that that is true. I believe it will be.

The reason, of course, that we were not able to hear your testimony at the sessions here last June was that we had too many other witnesses subpoenaed to be heard as we do apparently this time, Mr. Chairman.

Let me say that I think you have made a great addition to the information that is already on file concerning the activities of the Communist Party. But, chiefly, you have made a great contribution in substantiating, in large part, the testimony that was given by Mrs. Barbara Hartle and other witnesses who gave information here last June. For that we are very appreciative.

I want to say just a word about Mrs. Hartle.

As you know, she is presently serving in the prison in West Virginia, a Federal penitentiary in West Virginia.

I think she certainly exhibited a great deal of courage and a great deal of American spirit in giving the testimony that she did.

Mr. Dennett, as far as the particular testimony you have given about your expulsion from the Communist Party is concerned, the experience that you had is similar to the experience of other persons who have been expelled from the Communist Party.

I think, of course, that you should be proud to have been expelled by the Communist Party. And I trust that, while you might at

times find yourself in the same position of following the same line that the Communist Party does at the present time, that you no longer cling to the philosophy that we know the Communist Party represents here in the United States, that is, the philosophy of the Soviet Union, which intends of course, to rule the world eventually, whether it be by changing governments by peaceful means or by overthrowing it by force and violence.

We say it has been a great pleasure to hear your very fine testimony, and let me say also that I agree that you have been a very intelligent and truthful witness.

Mr. MOULDER. With our thanks and gratitude, you are excused.

Mr. DENNETT. Thank you, sir.

I wish to say, upon my being excused, that I want to extend my greatest appreciation to the patience of Mr. Tavenner, who has been the counsel to examine me. It has been a pleasure to work with a gentleman who is as well versed and who knows what he is doing as well as Mr. Tavenner.

And I want to thank Mr. Wheeler for the patience that he had, and the committee as well.

Mr. MOULDER. Call the next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Abraham Cohen.

Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand.

Mr. Photographer, when you take your picture, would you stand to the right or left so I can swear the witness.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give before this congressional committee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. COHEN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ABRAHAM ARTHUR COHEN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, EDWARD E. HENRY

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. COHEN. Abraham Arthur Cohen.

(Whereupon a brief disturbance occurred in the corridor outside the door of the hearing room.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Let's proceed.

Mr. MOULDER. Please be seated. We will have order in the hearing room, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will everyone be seated, please.

Mr. MOULDER. No pictures will be taken, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you seat those people at the door, and close the door, please.

I note you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself.

Mr. HENRY. Edward Henry, of the Seattle bar.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not going to take the time to ask you various questions which I know the committee is interested in asking you because of the lateness of the hour. I will confine my questions to just 2 or 3 matters. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COHEN. I am not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COHEN. I have been.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time were you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COHEN. From early in—well, I believe July 1937 until I left for the Armed Forces in March of 1942, and then upon returning from the war, oh, some time early in 1946, I would say, until January 1, 1951.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party since 1951?

Mr. COHEN. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe you are one of the few, if not the only person in the United States, who registered as a member of the Communist Party upon the adoption of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Mr. COHEN. It wasn't a thing of which I was ashamed. I felt I was in the party. I felt that what I was doing was the right thing. I had no conscientious qualms about belonging to it. I felt what we were doing was right. And everything that I saw—nothing I saw led me to believe that it was subversive. I felt it was—what we were doing was in the interest of the workingman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Our purpose in subpoenaing you was to ask you certain facts we think are within your knowledge regarding Communist Party activities. You have indicated a full desire, a willingness to give the committee the facts that you have. You have given a written statement to the staff.

Mr. COHEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not going into any of those matters now because they are here available for us. But, out of fairness to you, I want to give you the opportunity to make any further statement you desire regarding your own attitude toward the Communist Party.

Mr. COHEN. Do you feel that I haven't stated my position enough in that brief?

Mr. TAVENNER. We would ask you additional questions if we had time to do it, and we may do that later. But for the present I want to be certain you have an opportunity to tell the committee anything further that is on your mind that might be of some benefit to yourself.

Mr. COHEN. Well, I felt that my desires on leaving the party were that I was in it primarily because of its connection with the trade-union movement. It helped the Guild in the early days to organize.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you function within the American Newspaper Guild?

Mr. COHEN. That is right.

I felt it did a worthwhile job there. And a great many people—Communists and non-Communists—benefited thereby. After the war the situation changed.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not sure that he is through.

Mr. COHEN. I am ready to quit talking at any time.

Mr. TAVENNER. This is your time to talk if you want to.

Mr. COHEN. After the war I felt that we were in a—we were extending the neighborhood branches, and that the trade union, the time for trade union action was past. We didn't function in trade union matters. My working hours were changed, and I no longer was—I rarely attended meetings. I really lost what contact I had.

And the act that finally culminated in my leaving was the fact that I wanted to take a trip aboard, and under one of the provisions of

the McCarran Act it required that no Communist should be granted a passport.

And so I wanted to visit scenes of where I had been during the war, and I explained to the party that I wanted to leave. And it startled them. I admit, reasonably. But I succeeded in resigning. And there have been no repercussions since.

Mr. VELDE. Do I understand you have been, and are willing at any time to make available any information you have relative to your activities in the Communist Party?

Mr. COHEN. Yes, I am. I will say—before anybody even talks to me—there weren't very many. There were very few; there weren't very many.

Mr. VELDE. But are you willing to make those available to us?

Mr. COHEN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. And, of course, we would be willing to hear you at length if we had the opportunity to do so.

Mr. TAVENNER. In light of the witness' statements, I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you have any further statement you wish to make, Mr. Witness?

Mr. COHEN. Nothing further to say.

Mr. MOULDER. Then you are excused as a witness.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. May I call Mr. Dennett to the front of the rostrum for a moment?

TESTIMONY OF EUGENE VICTOR DENNETT, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, KENNETH A. MacDONALD—Resumed

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Dennett.

Mr. DENNETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. It has been my suggestion, after conferring with counsel, that probably it would be best that we revoke and withdraw our order excusing you from the force and effect of your subpoena, and keep your under subpoena.

Mr. DENNETT. I still have it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I believe there may be a legal technicality involved, and I ask that the witness be resubpenaed. So there will be no question about it.

Mr. MOULDER. It is so ordered.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is a matter of protection to the witness.

Mr. VELDE. I think we ought to make this additional statement, that the reason for resubpenaing you is so that you might be within the protection of the United States Government in case anything arises as apparently happened out here a few minutes ago.

Mr. MOULDER. That is our only purpose in issuing another subpoena.

Mr. DENNETT. Thank you.

Mr. MOULDER. Call the next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Bernard Freyd.

Mr. HATTEN. May I request the Chair to ask the photographers not to take pictures?

Mr. MOULDER. We will have order in the hearing room.

Mr. HATTEN. Will you please not take any pictures?

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Hatten.

Mr. HATTEN. I would like to request, Mr. Freyd does not like to have his picture taken in the hearing room. Would you so direct the photographers?

Mr. MOULDER. Very well.

The photographers will please refrain from taking pictures of the witness approaching the witness stand.

Hold up your right hand and be sworn, please.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this congressional committee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. FREYD. I do.

TESTIMONY OF BERNARD FREYD, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, C. T. HATTEN

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name?

Mr. FREYD. Bernard Freyd—F-r-e-y-d.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted you are accompanied by counsel.

Will counsel identify himself for the record?

Mr. HATTEN. My name is C. T. Hatten. I am an attorney residing in Seattle.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Freyd?

Mr. FREYD. I was born in Seattle in 1893.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. FREYD. I am not employed by anyone.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, briefly, what your formal educational training has been.

Mr. FREYD. I went through the public-school system, high school of this city, and University of Washington.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you complete your educational training at the University of Washington?

Mr. FREYD. It was about the year 1930.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, how you have been employed since 1935?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. FREYD. I had no regular employment until the outbreak of the war, and I worked in various war plants until I was incapacitated by an accident in 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your business between 1930 and the outbreak of the war?

Mr. FREYD. Well, I was unemployed.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that entire period of time?

Mr. FREYD. Practically, as I recollect.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you engaged in any work of any kind during that period?

Mr. FREYD. Well, there was no work available that I could find.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean you were unemployed until 1941, December 1941?

Mr. FREYD. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you live in 1940?

Mr. FREYD. I lived in Seattle.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in any work without remuneration?

Mr. FREYD. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. During the period from 1935 to 1940?

Mr. FREYD. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you connected with the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. FREYD. I think I should invoke the fifth amendment on that question as I feel that it may tend to incriminate me.

Mr. MOULDER. To clarify the response, do you decline to answer by invoking the fifth amendment of the Constitution, or do you refuse to answer for fear it will tend to incriminate you?

Mr. FREYD. And also the first amendment, which guarantees freedom of speech and of the press and the right of people to assemble peaceably.

Mr. TAVENNER. The witness who preceded you a few moments ago, Mr. Eugene V. Dennett, described his disagreement with the Communist Party in connection with its policy toward the Civil Rights Congress. He told the committee that the Communist Party had organized the Civil Rights Congress, but that he disagreed with the policy of forming an organization which would defend only Communists. And, for that reason, he incurred the wrath of his superiors in the Communist Party.

He further testified that he was told by the leadership of the Communist Party that it didn't have time to protect the civil rights of people generally, but it was only interested in the civil rights of members of the Communist Party.

Now it is our information that you held an official position in the Civil Rights Congress. I may be wrong about that. But surely you were in a position to know whether or not Mr. Dennett was telling the truth about the attitude of the Communist Party toward the Civil Rights Congress or the work of the Civil Rights Congress.

Mr. FREYD. I should like to confer with my attorney.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. FREYD. I invoke the first amendment and the fifth amendment for the reasons previously stated. And I may add that I am pleased to notice that there has been very widespread doubt expressed prominently in the press about the veracity of a witness testifying before this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you have any doubt about that you are now in a position to straighten the committee out on it. In what particular, if any, was Mr. Dennett in error in his testimony?

Mr. FREYD. I would like to confer with my counsel.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. FREYD. I claim, again, the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution, and I wish to add that I am reluctant to answer any questions which would require me to claim the protection of the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FREYD. The answer is the same, for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. FREYD. The answer is the same, and for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. MOULDER. Call the next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. HATTEN. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. HATTEN. While I am here may I address the Chair with reference to the O'Connell matter again?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

STATEMENT OF C. T. HATTEN, ATTORNEY AT LAW, SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. HATTEN. I notice that on a number of witnesses the subpoenas have been continued, and I would like to formally move that the subpoena in case of Jerry O'Connell be continued to some later date at which time his health might be better.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee cannot entertain your motion.

Mr. HATTEN. I merely would like to make it for the record.

Mr. MOULDER. You have made the request on the record.

Mr. HATTEN. To state the position, I understand that possibly you cannot pass upon it.

Mr. MOULDER. Call the next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Lenus Westman.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before this congressional committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. WESTMAN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF HANS LENUS ADOLPH WESTMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, C. T. HATTEN

Mr. WESTMAN. Mr. Chairman, under the first and fifth amendments—

Mr. TAVENNER. You haven't been asked any questions.

Mr. WESTMAN. O. K.

Mr. TAVENNER. We will give you a chance.

What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. WESTMAN. Under the first and fifth amendments, as the result of having been subpoenaed, I wish to apply these two amendments as reasons for not giving my name.

And also, in the light of the statement that was made here this afternoon, that you would like to have some witness that didn't have to use his name, that is, that you could have appearing before you.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are mistaken.

Mr. MOULDER. We will have order, please.

Mr. VELDE. Do you refuse to answer as to what your name is?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WESTMAN. I am going to confer with my attorney.

I wish to state that—

Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer the question.

Mr. WESTMAN. I will answer the question under protest.

My name is Hans Lenus Adolph Westman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell your last name?

Mr. WESTMAN. W-e-s-t-m-a-n.

MR. TAVENNER. It is noted that you are accompanied by counsel. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

MR. HATTEN. C. T. Hatten, previously identified as an attorney in Seattle.

MR. TAVENNER. Where do you live, Mr. Westman?

MR. WESTMAN. In Seattle.

MR. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

• MR. WESTMAN. I would like to confer with counsel.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

MR. WESTMAN. Well, I will answer under compulsion, and I am a sheetmetal worker.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you have any other occupation?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

MR. WESTMAN. Do you mean at the present time?

MR. TAVENNER. During the last month, say, during the month of March.

MR. WESTMAN. I would like to confer with my counsel.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

MR. WESTMAN. Well, sir, I would like—I will decline to answer that question under the fifth amendment, as I do not know what is referred to as work by the question, and, hence, it might be something that is construed by you, sir, as constituting work that might be of a character that would waive my rights under the fifth amendment. And, hence, I will take the fifth amendment.

MR. TAVENNER. I will be more specific.

Have you been engaged during the month of March in any publication work of any kind? That will limit it within narrow bounds.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

MR. WESTMAN. I will decline to answer that under the fifth amendment. And I would like to go into the reasons why I take the fifth amendment, because under—

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the witness has stated his reason as being the fifth amendment, which is a ground, under the circumstances here, I think he is entitled to use. And, therefore, it would not require any speech to accompany it.

MR. MOULDER. Please make a direct answer to the question. We will get along more quickly.

MR. WESTMAN. I said that under the fifth amendment I decline to answer that question, and I would like to just point out, Mr. Chairman, that I do take the fifth amendment because of the fact that it is in the Constitution to protect the innocent, and for the same reason that you gentlemen of Congress have congressional immunity.

MR. MOULDER. You have made yourself clear about the fifth amendment.

MR. TAVENNER. Have you at any time, during the month of March 1955, been the press director of the Communist Party?

MR. WESTMAN. I will decline to answer that under the first and fifth amendments, as, under the first amendment, that is directly inquiring into the freedom of the press and into matters of like nature, and, under the fifth amendment, I decline because such testimony might be construed as testimony against myself.

MR. TAVENNER. Mrs. Barbara Hartle testified before this committee in June of 1954. In the course of her testimony in identifying various individuals as members of the Communist Party, she stated:

Lenus Westman was a member of a club in the central region and lived in that area. Most of his Communist Party activities were in mass work at that time, like the Progressive Party or election work.

Tell the committee, please, what knowledge you have of the activities of the Communist Party, if any, within the Progressive Party.

Mr. WESTMAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will decline to answer that question under the fifth amendment.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WESTMAN. I think I have made my point clear on that.

Mr. MOULDER. May I ask you a question?

Where were you born and reared?

Mr. WESTMAN. I was born in Sweden, Umea, Sweden; and came to this country at the age of 7.

Mr. MOULDER. How old are you now?

Mr. WESTMAN. I am 52 years of age.

Mr. MOULDER. Are you a citizen of the United States?

Mr. WESTMAN. Yes, I am.

Mr. MOULDER. How long have you been a citizen?

Mr. WESTMAN. Since 1936.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you served in the armed services of the United States?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WESTMAN. Yes; I have.

Mr. MOULDER. What branch of the armed services?

Mr. WESTMAN. In the infantry, Army.

Mr. MOULDER. For what period of time?

Mr. WESTMAN. From July 1942, until February 1943.

Mr. MOULDER. Did you receive an honorable discharge from the service?

Mr. WESTMAN. Yes; I did.

Mr. VELDE. I would like to ask one question.

How did you obtain citizenship in this country?

Mr. WESTMAN. Through naturalization.

Mr. VELDE. Did you file your petition for naturalization on your own?

Mr. WESTMAN. It was by petition.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date of your naturalization?

Mr. WESTMAN. It was July 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it July 27, 1936?

Mr. WESTMAN. Yes; I think that was the exact date.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you naturalized?

Mr. WESTMAN. Here in Seattle in the Federal court.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you were naturalized?

Mr. WESTMAN. I decline to answer that question under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Communist Party now?

Mr. WESTMAN. I decline to answer that question for the same reasons that I have given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time between 1936 and the present date?

Mr. WESTMAN. I decline to answer that question for the same reason that I have given.

Mr. VELDE. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you were naturalized?

Mr. WESTMAN. I decline to answer that question also, and for the same reason.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me there is some evidence that should be referred to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service for future consideration, possibly with a view to denaturalization and deportation.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you elected to the Senate of the State of Washington in the election of 1940?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WESTMAN. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you serve? That is, were you seated?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WESTMAN. I decline to answer that question, sir, under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. I want to go a little further. When did you file your petition for naturalization?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WESTMAN. Well, at the moment I don't recall exactly when I filed the petition, but it is a matter of public record.

Mr. VELDE. Would it have been approximately 5 years before the date of your naturalization in 1936?

Mr. WESTMAN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Probably in 1931?

Mr. WESTMAN. It would be approximately in that period.

Mr. VELDE. How old were you at that time?

Mr. WESTMAN. I was 29, I believe, at that time.

Mr. VELDE. Then during the 5 years following your filing of a petition for naturalization did you engage in any type of Communist activity?

Mr. WESTMAN. I decline to answer that question for the reasons that I have given before.

Mr. VELDE. Did you know what the Communist Party was at that time?

Mr. WESTMAN. I decline to answer that question for the same reasons that I have given.

Mr. VELDE. Where, and in what court did you receive your citizenship?

Mr. WESTMAN. It was at the Federal courthouse here, but I am not sure at the present time which court it was.

Mr. VELDE. At the time that you received your citizenship in the court, United States district court, were you engaged in any Communist Party activities?

Mr. WESTMAN. I decline to answer that question for the same reasons that I have given before.

Mr. MOULDER. Have you, to your own best knowledge and information, ever committed any act, a subversive act or one of un-American conduct against the United States of America?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WESTMAN. Well, sir, under the fifth amendment, I must decline to answer that question, and I also know that this committee knows

that I have not been engaged in such activities. I am sure that this committee knows that.

Mr. VELDE. As a member of the committee, I certainly do not know that you have not been engaged in subversive activities.

Mr. MOULDER. It seems to me you now have an opportunity to tell the committee that you have not been engaged in subversive activities.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. WESTMAN. I still decline to answer the question under the fifth amendment because I do not consider this an opportunity.

Mr. MOULDER. You say you served in the Armed Forces for a period of how long?

Mr. WESTMAN. Approximately 6 or 7 months.

Mr. MOULDER. And why were you discharged?

Mr. WESTMAN. That was because I was over 40.

Mr. MOULDER. What was the extent of your services in the Armed Forces? Were you in combat service?

Mr. WESTMAN. No.

Mr. MOULDER. Are there any further questions?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Frank Kerr.

Will you come forward? Just have a seat, please.

(Mr. Frank Kerr came forward, accompanied by his counsel, Jay G. Sykes.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, this witness has been subpoenaed, and a doctor's certificate has been given which is wholly inadequate as a medical certificate to show that this gentleman was not in condition to appear here.

Counsel was advised to get a doctor and give us a certificate that we thought would mean something.

There may have been some confusion about who was to have the examination made, but, regardless of that, it is quite apparent, from observation, that the man is not well, and I don't feel satisfied in interrogating him under these circumstances unless the witness himself wants to be interrogated.

(Mr. Sykes conferred with Mr. Kerr.)

Mr. SYKES. He would rather not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Under those circumstances I do not feel like insisting on it.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you wish the subpoena to be continued or remain in full force and effect?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir. Under the circumstances, I think Mr. Kerr should be dismissed.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

(Whereupon the witness was excused.)

Mr. TAVENNER. There are no further witnesses, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. The hearing will remain in order.

As chairman of this subcommittee, and on behalf of the staff of the committee, our able counsel, Mr. Tavenner, and our investigator, Mr. Wheeler, and myself, we are all deeply grateful to the police de-

partment and the highly qualified police officers who have served this committee so faithfully and efficiently.

We are also deeply grateful and want to express our appreciation to all city, county, and Federal officials who have cooperated with us in every possible way.

As a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I want to say that I have attended many hearings in many sections of the United States, and I have never had the pleasure of enjoying more genuine, warm hospitality than has been extended to us during the hearings which have been held here in Seattle, Wash.

I am deeply grateful for the opportunity and the honor of having been associated with so many fine people as I have found here in Seattle. They have cooperated with us during the hearings.

We also wish to express our deep appreciation for the efficient service rendered by the sheriff's office, as well as all other public officials who have cooperated with us during the hearings.

Mr. Velde?

Mr. VELDE. I simply want to say this, Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the courteous and fair manner in which you have conducted the hearings here in Seattle.

I have a soft spot in my heart for the people in Seattle, and I concur with you that we have been given more courteous treatment, or at least as courteous treatment here in the city of Seattle and in the Northwest area as we have been given in any other section of the country. We really do appreciate it.

Mr. MOULDER. Thank you very much, Mr. Velde.

The committee will be adjourned.

(Whereupon, Saturday, March 19, 1955, at 5:35 p. m., the committee was recessed subject to the call of the Chair.)

×

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05706 3198

3126

= New York area
pts 1-4

3199 = Fort Wayne

3190 = Seattle pts 1-2

3191 = Milwaukee pts 1-2

3192 = Newark pts 1-2

